

August 31, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300130001-4

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

21523

member the pipelines and oil storage tanks. Yes, let it be known to the world that we shall meet their sophisticated weapons of violence with the crude and simple flame of a match. We cannot escape our historical mission of destiny any more than our oppressors can escape the destiny of retribution.

THE MOUNTING REFUGEE CRISIS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, today's New York Times carries an article about the work of the Refugees and Escapees Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee chaired by the able and distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

For the past 2 months, the subcommittee has been holding extensive hearings on the mounting refugee crisis in South Vietnam. The hearings have probed deeply into the problems and dilemmas involved in the humanitarian effort to help these hundreds of thousands of homeless men, women and children fleeing from their war-torn villages and rice fields.

As a member of Senator KENNEDY's subcommittee, I am delighted to note that the subcommittee's work has apparently resulted in a significant change in administration policy toward the refugee problem in South Vietnam. For the first time, a major portion of our AID program in South Vietnam will be directly devoted to the health and proper settlement of these needy and hapless refugees. The problems are substantial. There is much to be done but it is heartening that we are taking important steps in the right direction.

Great credit is due to the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts for under his effective leadership the work of the subcommittee has been constructive and productive. I am sure that under his able chairmanship, the subcommittee will continue to explore and recommend further improvements and solutions in our programs toward refugees.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that today's article from the New York Times, written by their able correspondent, Richard Eder, be reprinted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. REFUGEE PLAN FOR VIETNAM SET—SENATE HEARINGS DISCLOSED INCOHERENCE OF PRIVATE AND PUBLIC PROGRAMS

(By Richard Eder)

WASHINGTON, August 30.—The United States, reversing a previous policy, is setting up a full-scale program to assist the 400,000 refugees made homeless by the Vietnam fighting.

The decision to make refugee assistance a principal concern of the U.S. aid mission in Vietnam was in large part a result of recent hearings on the refugee problem conducted by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY of Massachusetts, according to U.S. officials.

Eight hearings held by a Senate subcommittee on refugees of which Mr. KENNEDY is chairman brought out, as one high official of the Agency for International Development said, that "in effect we have had no refugee program as such."

SEVERAL STEPS TAKEN

Over the last 3 weeks the State Department and the Agency have taken a number of steps to set one up. Among them are the following:

Approximately 40 officials of the Agency for International Development in Vietnam have been put to work full time on refugee problems. A great many other members of the 700-man AID mission will spend a major part of their time dealing with refugees. For example, according to one AID official here, 80 percent of the public health team will be assigned to refugees.

The administration is looking for a candidate to fill a new high-level job coordinating refugee programs. On one hand, he will act as an adviser to the Saigon Government. On the other, he will be able to draw on all the resources of the AID mission for assistance.

The first thorough studies of the refugees are now being made. These will include how many there are, where they are and how they are living, and in just what ways they are being helped now.

ESTIMATES ARE TENTATIVE

The U.S. Government does not now know how many refugees there are. South Vietnamese Government figures, which are not considered accurate, give rise to tentative estimates that there are 200,000 in camps and an equal number crowded into urban slums.

Virtually all of these came in during the Vietcong offensive in February and March, and during the monsoon fighting of May, June, and July. In recent weeks the influx appears to have tapered off somewhat.

Still another 200,000 who fled their homes in 1964 and earlier have been resettled.

Aid administered by private agencies, which was to run at \$8.5 million this year, is expected to rise considerably. Furthermore, the private agencies are expected to work out a program for closer cooperation with each other and with the U.S. program.

The Senate hearings disclosed a lack of proper coordination. A coordinating committee set up in Saigon has been rather inactive, the hearings showed.

Today President Johnson announced that he would send Dr. Howard A. Rusk, director of the Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation of the New York University Medical Center, to study the private agencies' work in Vietnam.

Dr. Rusk, who helped to organize a program of relief for refugees from the Korean war, is expected to survey the opportunities for private relief work, as well as the means of overcoming what is described as the spotty use by the agencies of available U.S. logistic support.

In Vietnam, the United States has had the Government send teams around to provincial governments to spur their programs. Some \$12 million is available to the provincial authorities, but little has been spent.

In part, according to officials here, this stems from the fact that many provincial officials are unfamiliar with the rules for using this money. In other instances, the officials do not want to spend the money for fear of being accused of favoritism by the residents of the area.

ESTIMATES ARE DIFFICULT

Since many details are still being worked out, officials here are unable to give a close estimate of how much the program will cost. One rough estimate was \$20 million. Any calculations are complicated, however, by the fact that much of the aid will be a rechanneling of existing programs.

For example, the major part of U.S. health, education, and possibly housing programs in Vietnam will now be specifically aimed at the refugees.

Until now, according to AID officials, the

United States has not had specific programs for the refugees. They received without special emphasis, a portion of the assistance under regular programs. Former Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor and his aid chief, James S. Killen, believed that refugee assistance should be an initiative of the Saigon authorities with the United States providing help as requested.

Partly because of a lack of interest and competence and partly because of the massive increase of refugees, this formula was not working.

According to AID officials, this was brought home by a series of alarming reports from the interior. Henry Cabot Lodge, the new Ambassador, told the Senate subcommittee earlier this month that the situation was gravely unsatisfactory.

According to officials here, the new program will still be designed to work through the Saigon government as much as possible. The difference will be that the United States will now take an active part in recommending measures and in providing money, personnel, and political pressure.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. GENIE MCGLASSON OF LINCOLN, NEBR., FOUNDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION POPPY DAY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a distinguished Nebraska lady who, over a long period of years, gave in vast measure the efforts of her heart and hands to the welfare of the Nation's disabled veterans has passed from the mortal scene.

On July 28, 1965, Mrs. Genie McGlasson died at Lincoln, Nebr., at the age of 87. Mrs. McGlasson long will be revered as the founder of the American Legion Poppy Day, an event which has done so much to further the rehabilitation and child welfare work carried on by the American Legion. Although originated by Mrs. McGlasson as a local effort, Poppy Day since has spread across the land and is nationally recognized as one of the American Legion's major programs.

Indicative of the place of affection and esteem she occupied is the fact that the funeral service for Mrs. McGlasson was the first ever held at the veterans administration hospital at Lincoln.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that two articles be inserted in the Record at this point. They are taken from the August 1965 issue of the Legion Auxiliary Star, department of Nebraska.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SHE LEAVES A SPOT THAT WILL BE HARD TO FILL

Mrs. Genie McGlasson, rehabilitation chairman and hospital director for the American Legion Auxiliary, department of Nebraska for 36 years, died July 28, 1965 in Lincoln, Nebr., at the age of 87.

Mrs. McGlasson had spent all day Friday of the previous week at her regular duties, volunteer hospital director of the Lincoln Veterans' Hospital; and was returned there on Saturday, July 31, to receive final honors from statewide friends. For the first time, a funeral was held at the 35-year-old hospital. The 10 a.m. service took place on the lawn before the open west porch where Mrs. McGlasson and patients years ago listened to band concerts. Salvation Army Maj. Charles Duskin officiated, assisted by the Reverends

Thomas Holoman and Loren Pretty, hospital chaplains. A poppy blanket made by Lincoln members of the American Legion Auxiliary covered the casket and paid tribute to Mrs. McGlasson as the originator of the American Legion poppy. In 1921, Mrs. McGlasson taught a small group of disabled veterans to make crepe paper poppies and sell them on street corners, with the proceeds going to the Legion's rehabilitation and child welfare committees. The poppy program has been adopted by the national organization.

A charter member of the Lincoln American Legion Auxiliary, Mrs. McGlasson had given unselfishly of her time, talent and self to promote and carry on the many phases of the rehabilitation and hospital program for the American Legion Auxiliary.

During her years with the auxiliary she served on the first unit welfare committee; was elected to the first department executive committee; attended the first national convention in Kansas City in 1921 and was elected president of Lincoln unit 3 in 1923.

She also was named national committee-woman from Nebraska in 1928; was appointed national chairman of the convention held in Omaha in 1926; traveled to the Paris, France, convention and was elected national chaplain; and also served as national community service chairman, and member for the national rehabilitation committee.

The feelings of a multitude of friends and associates in the State of Nebraska as well as members of the National American Legion Auxiliary, are summed up in the words given by Dr. J. Melvin Boykin, hospital director of the Lincoln VA hospital, "She leaves a spot that will be hard to fill."

#### A DOER OF GOOD

Mrs. Genie McGlasson, 87, longtime resident of Lincoln, is dead.

She will be remembered for a long while as the woman who started Poppy Day. But we are sure that this national institution was not started for her personal aggrandizement. She was too sincere for that.

Mrs. McGlasson was of the World War I generation who found her great life interest in veterans affairs, and, especially, the welfare and comfort of the men whose lives were wrecked by war. The Lincoln Veterans Hospital was more to her than a community asset. It was the place where disabled veterans would be required to spend their lives. They could not go out into the world, but she brought the world to them—a very good world.

There is not much a disabled veteran can do, and the days hang heavy for them. Mrs. McGlasson taught them how to take a little wire and a little crepe paper and make poppies. Then it naturally followed that the poppies would be sold to the public and the returns dedicated to the American Legion's rehabilitation and child welfare committee. An infinite amount of comfort to a great many resulted from her plain idea. A little wire, a little crepe paper, some willing disabled veterans developed enormous power for good. It is something that science has not been able to match, nor ever will because it includes the precious element of humanitarianism as it exists in people.

Mrs. McGlasson's work succeeded beyond measure but she exemplified the good that human compassion and interest can do and she heads the list of the many who with less acknowledgment and smaller effect do the same. We call that kind blessed.

#### CONVICTS, COMPUTERS, AND THE NUMBERS GAME

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, an age-old problem confronting those who administer penal institutions is how best to train and rehabilitate inmates for the

time they will be able to resume a normal life in society. In the State of Indiana much progress has been made in developing meaningful and useful programs to instruct prisoners how to become skilled members of trades or professions.

In the last few years the Indiana Reformatory at Pendleton has pioneered in providing specialized training in the operation of electronic computers and has established the first data processing school in the United States which is inside a prison. Most of the equipment and materials used for this data processing center has been donated by various private companies while several experts have generously given their time to help prisoners acquire the necessary knowledge and techniques. The experiment has proved so successful that three other penal institutions in Indiana have begun similar data processing instruction and the first graduation of inmates from this training program has been held.

Recently the magazine published by the employees of the Indianapolis Works employees of the Western Electric Co., described in some detail the excellent results achieved in helping to train prisoners for this important new field. Because it has national significance, I ask unanimous consent that this article in the August 1965 issue of Dial Tone be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### CONVICTS, COMPUTERS, AND THE NUMBERS GAME

Behind the high prison walls that once held budding badman John Dillinger, inmates of Indiana's maximum-security reformatory at Pendleton have figuratively shed their blue collars to learn data processing, one of America's fastest growing white-collar professions.

Not far from where other convicts are learning more conventional semiskilled repair or service trades, a carefully screened group of young prisoners staff the first data processing training school ever set up inside a prison.

Reformatory inmate No. 46252 (names will not be used to avoid embarrassment to their families, though they're used universally in conversations here) characterizes the elite inmate staff that operates this unique center.

Bright, with an aptitude for data processing work, he has survived one of the toughest inmate screening boards and the most rigorous training course in the institution. Chances are he'll be a low-risk parole violator when he gets out.

And the success of the program in the past 4 years has led skeptical prison officials to consider this one of the most promising, progressive self-rehabilitation efforts ever undertaken.

#### FIFTEEN-HOUR DAY

One role of the center is to train fellow inmates; another is to process data for the institution. During his 15-hour-long day, No. 46252 teaches computer classes for new students and handles his share of the burgeoning workload. He earns between 8 and 18 cents a day.

In the 4 years of its existence, the data center has expanded from a dingy three-room basement suite to more spacious, and colorfully decorated, quarters covering some 6,000 square feet. The inmate-computer expert is proud to point to what is considered one of the largest data processing libraries in the Midwest, jammed with books donated by sympathetic companies and individuals.

Donations have kept the program alive during its existence. "The interest and support from individuals, companies, and organizations has been overwhelming," wrote the center's inmate director in his latest annual report. Thus far, the center has received equipment, books, and training materials valued at more than \$250,000.

Some of the equipment—obsolete forms, surplus IBM wiring boards, and miscellaneous accessory equipment—has come from Western Electric's data processing department. In all, some 2 tons of equipment were trucked from Shadeland to the reformatory.

#### BOAST HUGE COMPUTER

Together with donations from other large companies the center now boasts 25 key-punches, 4 sorters, 4 tabulators, a reproducing punch, an interfiling reproducing punch, and the most recent prize acquisition—a huge Univac 60 computer.

Training in the three-step program takes 6 months. Convict 46252 spent some 406 hours in classes and approximately 1,600 hours working on center computer projects or completing homework behind locked cell doors.

To give the convicts a nodding acquaintance with industry methods, the inmate supervisors invite computer experts from industry to visit and instruct. Two of those giving time to the program were Western Electric's Dave Johnston, Jr., data processing department chief, and Blaine Flick, head of the plant's computer development department.

Johnston, as president of the central Indiana chapter of the Data Processing Management Association at the time, was also instrumental in getting DPMA endorsement of the three-phase training program in 1962.

#### WHAT TRAINING DOES

William L. Perrin, Indiana Department of Corrections official who's been closest to the program since its start in 1961, explained what the training does for inmates.

"Jail is the most degrading experience a man can ever go through," Perrin explained.

"The one thing an inmate loses is his self-respect. Brought here," he said in a tour at Pendleton, "stripped of his civilian clothes, quarantined and slapped in a cell, he's at his lowest ebb."

Progressive-minded rehabilitation officials feel that the exacting work of data processing, properly taught, helps the man develop a characteristic lacking in so many prison populations—precise analytical thought processes and a measure of self-confidence.

Underlying the entire program is the hope of employment for trained programmers, analysts, statisticians, and repairmen once the graduates leave prison. Yet only 7 of 17 parolees who've received certificates of graduation have landed computer jobs.

#### DROPOUTS NUMEROUS

If getting a computer job on the outside is difficult, being accepted into the training is more so. Last year, of 127 who applied for the program, only 53 were accepted. Only 14 of that 53 were issued the DPMA-endorsed data processing diploma.

What kind of prisoner is selected for the program? "We're looking for an individual who's trying to help himself," explained a long-term inmate supervisor, "but who can also produce something for us."

The philosophy established by the center's inmate founders is that once a man completes training, he is expected to train others. "We want to perpetuate this program," another inmate earnestly declared.

Once skeptical reformatory officials have allowed the program to expand, and now heartily endorse this type of white-collar rehabilitation. Center inmates have responded to this confidence by compiling more than 300,000 man-hours free of super-

21530

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 31, 1965

the money bill will provide a forum for Senator HARTKE and his supporters. They came within three votes of recommitting the bill granting General McKee special treatment to enable him to collect about \$8,000 a year in retirement benefits. Some of that support may be transferred into opposition to the supersonic transport appropriation although not enough to deny the President the money.

Privately, those Senators pushing for the supersonic transport program generally and the \$140 million specifically contend that there was no place other than the military to recruit the kind of experienced management needed to run the billion-dollar effort.

"Where are you going to get somebody who knows enough about the aircraft development to run the supersonic transport program," asked one Senator. "Do you really think you're going to get a \$75,000-a-year man from Boeing or Douglas or any place else to work for the FAA for less than half that money? We're getting near the metal cutting stage now. Where are you going to go to get somebody who really knows aircraft development and procurement if you don't go to the military?"

Although Bain enjoyed considerable support within the aerospace industry during his tenure as FAA's supersonic transport chief, backers of General Maxwell counter Bain's work was mainly organizing the Government's paper effort. The hardware stage, they contend, demands a breadth of experience different from the experience Bain brought to the job.

One byproduct of having military officers at the forefront of the civilian supersonic transport development is bound to be a full assessment of the military potential of the aircraft, despite the contention of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara that there is no military requirement for it. This could be a most significant byproduct, including the very real possibility that the Defense Department eventually will pay for part of the supersonic transport's development—perhaps the engines.

#### DEPARTURE OF BAIN SPURS CONCERN OVER FUTURE FAA DIRECTION OF SST

WASHINGTON.—Gordon M. Bain's decision to leave the Federal Aviation Agency where he has directed the supersonic transport program since 1963 has created concern among airlines and aircraft manufacturers over the future of the program.

Adding to the uncertainty is the appointment of Air Force Brig. Gen. Jewell C. Maxwell, to replace Bain.

Bain's resignation is effective September 15. Bain said it was for "personal reasons" and that he plans to return to private industry, although he has not said where or what his new job will be.

Bain was considered to have a sympathetic understanding for the problems faced by both the airlines and the airframe and engine manufacturers in developing a practical transport.

"We differed with him on a lot of points, but at least you could argue constructively with him," one airline equipment planner said.

The fact that the supersonic transport is a commercial enterprise, and that it is to be directed by an active-duty Air Force general, is the basis for most of the current concern. However, Gen. William F. McKee, FAA Administrator, said in making the appointment that General Maxwell was the best man he could find who had lengthy experience in R. & D. work.

The job Bain holds pays \$24,500 a year, which is not considered high by industry standards for a project like the supersonic transport.

General Maxwell, 48, is presently commander of the Air Force Western Test Range at Vandenberg AFB, Calif. Among his research and development activities was serv-

ice as chief military coordinator in development of the Boeing B-52 bomber.

He is a former chief of staff of USAF Systems Command, and in 1963 was chairman of the aircraft committee of Project Forecast, which included analysis of future Air Force needs for transports. For 5 years he was chief of the bomber aircraft division at Wright-Patterson AFB. General Maxwell flew 44 missions as a Martin B-26 pilot in World War II, and was executive officer of the 386th Bomb Group in the European Theater of Operations.

He holds a mechanical engineering degree from the University of Tennessee, a masters degree in aeronautical engineering from Princeton University, and is a graduate of the War College.

Industry sources are avoiding any public comments on the merits of General McKee's bringing a fellow Air Force officer into the supersonic transport program. The airlines are particularly anxious to see to what extent General Maxwell will seek their advice.

"The supersonic transport must be developed in a fish bowl, without any secrecy," one airline officials said. "The airlines do not buy off-the-shelf aircraft. Each one, even though it is a basic model, must have features desired by the individual carrier."

At present, FAA sources said, the only part of the supersonic transport still covered by Defense Department security is performance and interior technology on the engines.

Bain told Aviation Week & Space Technology that he felt now was the most opportune time for him to resign.

"When I took this job in 1963, I had no intention of seeing it through to the end," Bain said. "My job was to pull everything together and get it headed forward in good order. That has been done, and the pattern for the next 18 months is set. So I feel it is a good time for me to step out."

Industry officials who have worked closely with Bain acknowledge that he has kept the program working smoothly and that schedule deadlines have been met. The main point of disagreement between himself and the industry has been over the eventual production of flying prototypes—the industry wanting two and Bain insisting on one.

"We in the industry know that the best airplane and engine always comes from an intense competition," one airline official said, "but recognize that Gordon might have had a tough time convincing the Government that the added expense \* \* \* was justified."

Bain's leading role in the program also was affected when President Johnson named Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara to head a special advisory committee whose recommendations led to the recent phase 2C research decision.

Spokesmen said it was apparent during negotiations on the phase 2C contracts that Bain was not in complete agreement with the order to continue research for another 18 months.

"We cannot expect delivery of a U.S. supersonic transport now before 1975," one industry spokesman said. "But Gordon agreed with those of us who know we could have it ready by 1973."

#### THE THEORY THAT THE VIETNAMESE COMMUNISTS ARE BASICALLY ANTI-CHINESE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, we are frequently assured by those who urge an American withdrawal from Vietnam that our withdrawal will not result in turning Vietnam and southeast Asia over to the effective political control by Peiping. We are told that the Vietnamese Communists are basically anti-Chinese, that Ho Chi Minh is basically another

Tito, and that the most effective way of assuring the continued independence over Vietnam from Peiping would be to turn the entire country over to the control of the so-called Nationalist Communists.

Mr. President, I believe that the most effective answer to those who entertain these theories was recently given by the Chairman of the Presidium of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, in a letter to Mao Tse-tung. This letter was broadcast over Peiping domestic service on August 19. Let me quote to you the words of the broadcast letter to the patron saint of the Chinese Communists:

On behalf of the South Vietnam people and the NFLSV, and in my own name, I would like to extend the warmest and highest respect to you, the great leader of the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people. The South Vietnamese people are deeply inspired by receiving the full and valuable sympathy and support from the Chinese Communist Party and the fraternal Chinese people in their patriotic and just struggle and war of resistance against the U.S. imperialist aggressors and their lackeys and for national independence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this inserted into the Record at this point, the entire text of the letter from Nguyen Huu Tho to Mao Tse-tung.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Communist China, International Affairs, Aug. 20, 1965]

#### NFLSV CHAIRMAN'S LETTER TO MAO TSE-TUNG

Chairman Mao Tse-tung recently received a letter from Nguyen Huu Tho, Chairman of the Presidium of the NFLSV Central Committee, thanking the Chinese people for their support to the South Vietnam people in their struggle against U.S. imperialist aggression. At the same time, Chairman Liu Shao-chi, NPC Chairman Chu Te, and Premier Chou En-lai also received letters from Comrade Nguyen Huu Tho. The letters were hand delivered to Premier Chou En-lai by Tran Van Trung, head of the NFLSV permanent delegation to China, on August 12.

The full text of Chairman Nguyen Huu Tho's letter to Chairman Mao Tse-tung reads:

SOUTH VIETNAM,

June 1, 1965.

#### CHAIRMAN MAO TSE-TUNG OF THE CCP

##### CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

DEAR CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the South Vietnam people and the NFLSV, and in my own name, I would like to extend the warmest and highest respect to you, the great leader of the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people. The South Vietnam people are deeply inspired by receiving the full and valuable sympathy and support from the Chinese Communist Party and the fraternal Chinese people in their patriotic and just struggle and war of resistance against the U.S. imperialist aggressors and their lackeys and for national independence.

The historic statement issued by you on August 29, 1963, on the South Vietnam question is of great significance to the revolutionary cause of the South Vietnam people. It also demonstrated once again the close, solid militant friendship between the Chinese and South Vietnam people, and has strengthened further our solid strength to defeat the U.S. aggressors.

To avoid its inevitable defeat in South Vietnam, U.S. imperialism is exerting great efforts to intensify its war of aggression against South Vietnam, has dispatched to

August 31, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

21529

lack of education, lack of love, have little chance of rising above the culture of despair.

Birth control does not solve all the problems of poverty. But it does help the poor regulate the growth of their families. Expenses are cut. The health of the mother improves because she isn't having too many children too quickly. The fear of bearing another child, who might mean increased poverty, diminishes.

The costs of unwanted and unplanned children are immeasurable. The human suffering caused by and to them and the financial strain on the family and community are more than we realize. Among low income, low educated parents surveyed recently, 54 percent of their children were unplanned and unwanted. For every 100 patients visiting a planned parenthood center in 1962: 66 have incomes of \$74 or less per week; 33 are on welfare or have incomes of less than \$50 a week; 78 are less than 30 years old; 21 are less than 20 years old; and 69 have three children or less.

What are the economic aspects of increased population in the United States?

1. Increasingly, we may expect our rapid increase in numbers to burden, rather than accelerate, our economy.

2. Increased expenditures—mostly public funds—needed to supply schools and colleges, health facilities, housing, water supplies, transportation, power, etc., for the expanding population will mean a substantially higher tax burden and bigger government.

3. This year 4 million new babies will be born in the United States, and between 15 and 20 percent of all tax revenues will have to be spent simply to give them basic services.

4. The U.S. Office of Education estimates that Americans spent \$32 billion last year on schooling—three-quarters of it from tax funds.

What must be done to meet this challenge?

1. Research on a far larger scale must be supported on the biological and medical aspects of human reproduction so improved methods of fertility control are developed.

2. The American people must be informed of the enormous problems inherent in unchecked population growth here as well as abroad.

3. A sense of responsibility must be developed concerning marriage and parenthood, including the responsibility of bringing into the world only those children whom parents want and are prepared adequate to care for and educate.

4. Existing knowledge about birth control at low or no cost must be made available to those who need and wish such information and guidance.

The Federal Government has spent millions of dollars in research so that the health of the world could be improved. The effectiveness of our federally financed research in cooperation with private enterprise has been so effective that we have now virtually eliminated many of the killer diseases and our death rate is now very low. Now our public health officials must concern themselves with the increase in population which threatens the health and well-being of many millions of people.

In my judgment, action is required. I suggest:

1. Public health organizations at all levels of government should give increased attention to the impact of population change on health.

2. Scientific research should be greatly expanded on (a) all aspects of human fertility; and (b) the interplay of biological, psychological, and socioeconomic factors influencing population change.

3. Public and private programs concerned with population growth and family size should be integral parts of the health program and should include medical advice and

services which are acceptable to the individuals concerned.

4. Full freedom should be extended to all population groups for the selection and use of such methods for the regulation of family size as are consistent with the creed and more of the individuals concerned.

Recognizing that the population problem, nationally and internationally, has become a serious crisis, we must determine a course of action. I recognize that a great deal of work has already been done by the drug firms throughout America and other interested organizations. Nothing should be done to detract from their achievements. In fact, we should compliment their efforts.

Our public health officials should fully utilize the devices and information that are now available. It is my understanding that even though our law provides that money can be used for family-planning services, few agencies use it. Our officials must face up to their responsibilities.

We must mount an educational program that will inform the American public of the wisdom and advisability of planning parenthood. There has been substantial information and know-how collected. It must now be used.

Mr. Chairman, the meetings that we have held have been most informative and most valuable. I am hopeful that the great reservoir of knowledge that has been pulled together will be used by the Federal Government and State governments in their efforts to meet these population problems and the problems experienced by our individual citizens who must concern themselves with the need for planning their families. I have appreciated serving on this committee and am grateful for the opportunity of presenting this statement.

### THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT PROGRAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, two articles published in the August 30, 1965, issue of Aviation Week demonstrate a continuing concern over the future of the civilian agencies of our Government, especially the FAA.

The military takeover is continuing at a steady pace and again should be an item of national discussion. The two articles are well written and of Senate interest, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONGRESS TO APPROVE SST MONEY REQUEST—MAJOR OPPOSITION UNLIKELY, BUT PROTEST BUILDS ON APPOINTMENT OF USAF OFFICER TO HEAD FAA PROGRAM

(By George C. Willson)

WASHINGTON.—Congress within the next few days will approve President Johnson's request for \$140 million in fiscal 1966 funds for the supersonic transport program but not without protesting what some Members contend is militarization of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Chairman, GEORGE H. MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, of the House Appropriations Committee, told Aviation Week & Space Technology there was no significant opposition in the House to the President's supersonic transport money request. "I think people are sold on the idea that this supersonic transport is desirable. I think it will be a routine thing" to get House approval.

But a protest is building in the Senate, led by Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana. He said he is "very disturbed" over the imminent replacement of Gordon Bain,

deputy administrator for supersonic transport development, by an Air Force general and intends to make an issue of it when the money request reaches the Senate, if not before. Senator HARTKE objected to the naming of USAF Gen. William F. McKee (retired) as FAA administrator on grounds it amounted to militarizing the civilian agency (Aviation Week & Space Technology, June 28, p. 31).

### WEATHERS ATTACK

Although General McKee weathered this attack and was confirmed, the whole question will be raised again because General McKee has announced that USAF Brig. Gen. Jewell C. Maxwell will replace Bain.

To blunt expected criticism of militarization of the FAA, General McKee told the Senate that while General Maxwell was joining the agency another general was leaving it—USAF Maj. Gen. M. S. White, Federal air surgeon. Dr. Peter V. Siegel, a civilian who has been serving as Chief of the FAA Aeromedical Certification Division at the Office of Aviation Medicine in Oklahoma City, will replace General White.

Senator HARTKE contends that the arrival of General Maxwell and departure of General White do not balance out because of the overwhelming importance of the civilian supersonic transport program. He has asked General McKee why the title of the job to be held by General Maxwell has been changed from deputy director for supersonic transport development, to "director, supersonic transport program."

Other questions Senator HARTKE has asked General McKee by letter to answer are: "Why was a military man selected for this position? Was any search made for a civilian to fill this position? Is any civilian technically competent and qualified to fill this important position? Is there any civilian in the aviation industry technically competent and qualified to fill this position? Is there any civilian in any of our aviation engineering schools, such as Massachusetts Institute of Technology, California School of Technology, Purdue or others, who could fill this position? Is it considered necessary that a military man take this post? If so, should the supersonic transport development program be transferred from the Federal Aviation Agency to the jurisdiction of the Pentagon?"

Chairman A. S. MIKE MONAGHEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, of the Senate Aviation Subcommittee, who has championed the supersonic transport in the Senate in the past, said, "I don't expect a flap" over the replacement of Bain by General Maxwell. Whether there will be a sizable fight when the \$140 million appropriation reaches the Senate floor, or before, depends on how much support Senator HARTKE recruits.

The House Appropriations Committee will lump the \$140-million for the supersonic transport with other Presidential requests for fiscal 1966 supplemental appropriations. The whole bill will be voted within the next few days. Then it goes to the Senate special subcommittee for supplemental requests, headed by Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island. Senator MONAGHEY is on this subcommittee and probably will defend the supersonic transport money request when it reaches the Senate floor. Because Congress is pushing hard to get the money bills out of the way so it can adjourn as soon after Labor Day as possible, the supplemental appropriations will reach a vote in the Senate a few days after it clears the House. No separate bill authorizing the supplemental appropriations is required as in most regular money bills.

### HARTKE'S FORUM

Although the supplemental appropriation for the supersonic transport is entirely separate from the question of whether the appointments of Generals McKee and Maxwell threaten to militarize the FAA, the debate on



August 31, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

21531

South Vietnam tens of thousands of U.S. troops and some troops of its vassal countries, and has continuously extended the bandit war to North Vietnam. At the same time, it has spread the so-called unconditional peace talks tricky offer, attempting to deceive world opinion and to cover up its true aggression and bellicose nature. However, the NFLSV Central Committee's five-point statement issued on March 22, 1965, has pointed out that the South Vietnam people are convinced that no frantic schemes, no tricky arguments, and no modern weapons and troops of U.S. imperialism and its vassals could make the 14 million patriotic South Vietnam people submit or snake their will to fight and win.

With the wholehearted sympathy and thorough support of the great 650 million Chinese people, the people of the various socialist countries, and all the peace-loving people throughout the world, our people in South Vietnam are resolutely taking up arms with the determination to fight to the last drop of blood in driving U.S. imperialism out of South Vietnam, liberating South Vietnam, and unifying the fatherland in order to contribute to the national liberation and the defense of peace in southeast Asia and the world.

Our people in South Vietnam exceedingly admire the indomitable revolutionary spirit of the Chinese people, whom we follow as an example. The Chinese people, under the brilliant banner of the CCP which regards the people as master, have victoriously carried on long-term resistance and, with their brilliant example, inspired all the oppressed people throughout the world to wage the struggle for their liberation.

Now, the Chinese people are building a prosperous and strong China through their laboring efforts and lofty spirit on self-reliance, and making an important contribution to the lofty causes of revolution of the world's people and of world peace.

The people of South Vietnam feel a great joy over all those brilliant achievements of the CCP and the great Chinese people and sincerely convey their wishes to the CCP and the Chinese people under your wise and brilliant leadership for still more brilliant successes.

I wish to take this opportunity in behalf of the people in South Vietnam and the Central Committee of NFLSV in expressing my most sincere gratitude to you and wishing the best of health.

NGUYEN HUU THO,  
Chairman of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the NFLSV.

#### THE LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN WATER PLAN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in the last several days a number of distinguished California citizens, public servants of my State in various fields, have testified before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in favor of legislation to provide for a Lower Colorado River Basin water plan. The whole southwest area is in dire straits with respect to the problem of water in the future. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in *RECORD* at this point the statements by the attorney general of California, Thomas C. Lynch; Northeutt Ely, special counsel for the Colorado River Board of California, and six Agency Committee of California Water Users; and the joint statement of W. S. Gookin, I. P. Head, W. E. Steiner, D. E. Cole, and W. D. Whelan; the individual statement of D. E. Cole, chief engineer of the

Colorado River Board of California; and the Colorado River Basin seven-State consensus.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

STATEMENT BY CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL THOMAS C. LYNCH, APPEARING AT THE REQUEST OF GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 24, 1965

Mr. Chairman, my name is Thomas C. Lynch. I am the attorney general of California. I have the honor to appear not only in that capacity, but at the request of the Governor of my State, Edmund G. Brown. He wants me to tell you that he would be here today but for the aftermath of the last two tragic weeks in our State. He wants me to tell you that he wholeheartedly and enthusiastically supports the legislation offered by 37 Representatives in Congress and by both California Senators.

I assure you that a California consensus—as close to unanimity as you will find in a State of nearly 20 million people—supports the Governor in that position.

That position is urged by the Colorado River Board of California, a State agency whose members are nominated by the public entities which have Colorado River water rights: The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, the San Diego County Water Authority, Imperial Irrigation District, Palo Verde Irrigation District, and Coachella Valley County Water District. Each of these public agencies supports the pending bill.

Likewise, it has the most earnest support of our sister State—our historic water antagonist with whom we are now in agreement—Arizona. It has the support of Nevada, which has a community of interest with both Arizona and California. It has the support in principle of the U.S. Government, expressed by the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Interior.

I hope and I believe that this legislation will come to have the strong support of other regions: the States of the upper Colorado River Basin and Western States outside the Colorado River Basin which may be benefited. It deserves the support of the entire Nation. The most immediate benefit will be to the Lower Colorado River Basin, whose problems produced this agreement after decades of embittered and futile combat. Benefits, less immediate but fully as substantial, will later accrue to areas adjacent to the Colorado River Basin. The precedent and the principle mark a legal and political breakthrough as important as any new scientific discovery in man's fight against drought.

I was delighted to learn on Friday that representatives of the seven Colorado River basin States had agreed on basic principles for regional legislation. This is good news for the entire Nation.

The seven-State accord is a second great step toward making regional water development a reality. This accord will be as significant as the original agreement between Arizona and California which established unity among the lower basin States—Arizona, California, and Nevada—earlier this year.

Many problems remain, but they will also yield to the constructive spirit with which the seven States have approached their problems. I am sure this committee will give thorough attention to the unresolved problems as the hearings progress. I should like to confine myself to the very significant subjects on which there now appears to be a meeting of the minds.

The lower basin agreement which has united Arizona, California, and Nevada is, as

I am sure everyone in this room fully realizes, an astonishing development. It came about when men of good will from all over the Colorado River basin became fully aware that the interests of our region can be served only by agreement and not by combat. We shall all face a continuing struggle and problems far more serious than anyone could have realized in 1952 when Arizona and California squared off against each other for the fourth time in the U.S. Supreme Court. Now, our struggle is against nature. It is a struggle we can win if we are all together; which we shall surely lose if we are divided.

I had the privilege of watching the agreement happen. I shall tell you about it in some detail, because the time has come for further agreement—this time in the Congress of the United States. We look to this committee to fashion a final agreement which will serve the West and set a pattern for the rest of the country which is reaching the limits of available water, and which must eventually turn to regional planning as the basis of regional accomplishment.

I became attorney general of California at the beginning of September 1964. The constitution of California imposed on me the responsibility of representing California in interstate litigation. I was told by some that the problems of the Colorado River were insoluble. The U.S. Supreme Court had entered a decree in *Arizona v. California* the preceding March. The decree had not settled the problems of the Colorado. It had only framed some of the issues for renewed combat. I made it my first business to study the Colorado problem intensively. I have continued to do so. I discovered that these reports were in substance correct. Winston Churchill once described Russia as "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." He might well have been speaking of the Colorado.

The decree concluded one of the greatest trials in history. The purpose of the suit was to answer yes or no to the question posed in 1952 by the State of Arizona: Is there water to supply the Central Arizona project?

The decree failed to answer that question. Instead, it answered two others: First, how is 7.5 million acre-feet per year of consumptive use from the main river to be divided among Arizona, California, and Nevada? It is to be divided 2.8 million to Arizona, 4.4 million to California, 300,000 acre-feet to Nevada.

Second, how is water in excess of 7.5 million acre-feet to be divided among them? It is to be divided equally between Arizona and California, except that the Secretary of the Interior may by contract give 4 percent of the excess to Nevada, coming out of Arizona's 50 percent.

Lest there be any doubt, I repeat what my predecessor said, "We accept those decisions. We do not ask Congress to change the Court's decree."

Unfortunately, these omit the major question which requires an answer: How is less than 7.5 million acre-feet to be divided? Engineering opinion was unanimous that ultimately there would be no excess over 7.5 million acre-feet for the three States. In time, there will be less than 7.5 million acre-feet. But the court expressly refused to decide how a supply of less than 7.5 million acre-feet would be divided. The court left that question to be decided by the Secretary of the Interior or the Congress.

There are two limitations on the Secretary's power: (1) "Present perfected rights" must be given interstate priority by the Secretary before he allocates the remaining water among the States. (2) The court will review the Secretary's exercise of discretion. However, the quantities of "present perfected rights"—those exercised by use prior to 1929 when the Boulder Canyon Project Act became effective and all Federal rights exist—

21532

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 31, 1965

ing on that date—are left to future agreement or litigation. The standards by which secretarial discretion is to be controlled are otherwise unspecified.

As an alternative to a secretarial allocation, Congress can enact legislation providing for allocation of shortages if the main river supplies less than 7.5 million acre-feet.

The court left unanswered the question Arizona had in effect asked the Supreme Court: "Is there water for the Central Arizona project?"

It left unanswered the question we in California face: "Is there to be a disastrous exception to the historic rule of law throughout the West that water is never taken from existing projects to supply new projects to be built in the future?" We thought there could be only one answer.

There was no possibility whatever that Arizona could be expected to yield that which Arizona had sought for a generation, and for which her need is increasingly great: the Central Arizona project.

There was no possibility whatever that California would yield water used by her projects in order to build the Central Arizona project, except as a decree by the Supreme Court had so determined. The Supreme Court had expressly and unanimously rejected the Special Master's recommendation that proration of shortages within the 7.5 million acre-feet should be imposed on the States. We demanded, as we had to, protection of existing projects. The Arizona Legislature twice sought the same protection for Arizona's existing projects.

Secretary Udall had suggested in two successive regional plans a way to avoid the hard question to which the answer appeared so ruinous to Arizona or California. Our entire region is indebted to his inspiration, stimulated I am sure by the dreadful responsibility the Court had thrust on him to destroy either the hopes of Arizona or the existing projects of California.

The resource of the Colorado is water. Water generates power. Power generates money. And through money the water supply can be made to replenish itself. Imports of water can avoid shortages in the 7.5 million acre-foot quantity. Water users in both States would be made whole to the extent of the decreed allocations out of that 7.5 million acre-feet.

The two Pacific Southwest water plans could not, however, overcome the handicap of lack of time. Arizona's need for a Central Arizona project was immediate and urgent. Investigations, engineering, and economic studies were necessary for a project to import water to replace Colorado River water exported to central Arizona. All three take substantial time, even on a crash basis. My State resisted—it had to resist—a Central Arizona project which would deplete the water available to California projects so long as replacement of that water was only a hope or a promise.

After several months of study, I attended my first public meeting devoted to this unhappy dilemma. It was called in December by the Southern California Water Conference. Representatives from all over the Colorado River Basin were present.

There was a serious—even grimly somber mood—of men patiently willing to state and restate without rancor their deeply held positions. There was a firm determination not to compromise or suggest compromise in matters essential to survival.

Californians protested they did not insist upon 4.4 million acre-feet from the Colorado and also water from some alternative source. But they could not yield that 4.4 million until the alternative source had been achieved. That would take time.

Californians also recognized Arizona's need. They did not want to insist that Arizona's overdrawn groundwater basins continue to be pumped without respite until a great

regional plan to replace the central Arizona project supply could be readied for adoption as a whole. But they were determined to defend California's 4.4 million acre-feet.

At the end of the conference, this question emerged:

Is it possible to estimate the shortage in the Colorado River supply and provide for priority of existing projects until an import of water to make up that shortage has actually been achieved?

Next day, Secretary Udall came to Los Angeles. While the California group was waiting to meet with him, the question was put to the chief engineer of the Colorado River board. He estimated the probable ultimate shortage at 2.5 million acre-feet.

That consists of 1.5 million acre-feet annually which the Mexican Treaty assures to Mexico, and about 1 million acre-feet of annual channel and reservoir losses between Lee Ferry—where the lower basin begins—and the Mexican boundary. You can see that unless 2.5 million acre-feet is imported, the 7.5 million acre-feet annual average—which article III(d) of the Colorado River compact requires to be delivered at Lee Ferry—will provide only 5 million acre-feet of consumptive use.

Would it be possible to assure protection for existing projects until at least 2.5 million acre-feet was imported into the main river?

Stewart Udall gave a cautiously affirmative reply. This inspired negotiations which resulted in the legislation before you.

In the first week in February, Senator KUCHEL offered S. 1019 in the U.S. Senate. Counterparts were offered in the House, and Senator HAYDEN has said that he will press for prompt passage in the Senate if one of these counterparts is passed by the House.

I shall not try to discuss the details of the bill. I shall point out only how it answers the hardest questions.

First, it gives the same protection to existing projects of all three states, Arizona, California, and Nevada, except that California is limited in that protection to 4.4 million acre-feet. If there is less than 7.5 million acre-feet, shortage will be borne by the Central Arizona project before existing projects are forced to cut back. The 4.4 limitation on California exists because only California's existing projects use more than the quantity decreed out of the first 7.5 million acre-feet available each year from the river.

You would suppose that this was not a matter of consequence to Arizona projects, since Arizona's uses plus Central Arizona project use will be substantially less than Arizona's 2.8 million acre-feet. In fact, the problem was of universal concern. As I have said, Arizona's Legislature has twice sought protection for Arizona's present projects against demands of the Central Arizona project. This bill makes that principle applicable to both sides of the river, and to all three States.

Second, the bill makes it unnecessary to provide an answer to the truly unknown and unknowable "ultimate water supply" available from the Colorado. That requires study of hydrology and law. The law is the Colorado River compact which only the Supreme Court at the end of another 10 years of litigation may definitively construe. We must avoid that path. This bill requires an answer only to the easy question. How much water is probably available to the lower basin until imports from other regions become available? That question, I am assured, can be answered: Enough to justify the Central Arizona project for immediate authorization and construction on these conditions. That, I am sure, will be the subject of engineering testimony and evidence before you.

Third, the bill makes it unnecessary to face the cruelest dilemma ever imposed by man or nature on a great region: Either to go on

letting temporarily unused upper basin water flow down the river, unused, to the Gulf of California; or put it to use with projects which must be abandoned when the upper basin requires that presently unused water to which it has a guaranteed right by compact. This bill uses that wasted water for its best purpose—a temporary resource to be replaced by imports.

Fourth, this bill gives every State and every region a continuing incentive to make the regional plan work. Arizona and California both need far more water than they can expect from their shares of 7.5 million acre-feet. This bill gives both States an equal interest in the excess above 7.5 million acre-feet which must be provided. It gives the maximum assurance now possible that a choice between an empty Lake Powell in the upper basin or an empty Lake Mead in the lower basin need never be made.

I will conclude by telling you that there is still some controversy about the bill in California. However, it is a happy kind of controversy. Who is entitled to the most credit for launching the agreement?

Like victory of any kind, this plan has—I should say it has needed—many fathers. We are still, I think, in the negotiating stages. I hope that the members of this committee who are not from Lower Colorado River Basin States will promptly enter their claims to joint paternity. We need your support.

I would pay tribute to the three men who have done more than any others to further this concept of regional planning. The first is Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, who offered two regional plans which contained basic principles of the bills before you.

The second is Governor Brown. First, in launching the California water plan as the first major business of his administration, he demonstrated to the Nation that regional animosities can be reconciled to the benefit of mutually hostile antagonists. Second, he defended Secretary Udall's plan when Arizona and California would otherwise have killed the concept with renewal of ancient hostility.

The third is Senator KUCHEL. He has provided leadership which has put regional water problems ahead of party politics, ahead of interstate hostilities, and ahead of personal advantage. His bill is S. 1019 in the Senate. The 37 House bills we heard first, in this committee, because this appears to be the best and quickest way to get the job done.

Mine is a rare privilege. To travel to Washington as attorney general of California and to urge approval on behalf of the Governor of California of a central Arizona project, with the assurance that I will be well received when I return to California. I think you will want to share with me the sense of great accomplishment that has come to all of us who have helped fashion the present agreement.

STATEMENT OF NORTHCUTT ELY, SPECIAL COUNSEL, COLORADO RIVER BOARD OF CALIFORNIA, AND SIX AGENCY COMMITTEES OF CALIFORNIA WATER USERS BEFORE THE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 27, 1965

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Northcutt Ely. I am a lawyer, a member of Ely, Duncan & Bennett, Washington, D.C.

Last week I had the honor to appear before you, accompanying Attorney General Thomas Lynch of California, in my capacity as special assistant attorney general in charge of the case of *Arizona v. California*. I shall therefore not repeat the analysis of that case given you by Attorney General Lynch, nor the historical background and statement of the issues which Senator KUCHEL gave you on the opening day.

I appear before you today as special counsel for the Colorado River Board of Califor-

August 31, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4899

wink and deceive him. In the jungle of life, he is a tiger without claws.

If the lamp flickers: The fact that a democratic republic can succeed only to the degree that the electorate is educated was recognized by the wise and experienced leaders who founded our system of government. The Government, from the beginning, has accepted responsibility for the education of the people. True, administration of public education is preferable on a local level where local needs are better understood, but the National Government has always stood watchfully in the background, ready with its resources to back up and implement local efforts. Such gestures as the proclamation of National Literacy Week are bound to be helpful. This is a way of saying officially that the American people are aware of the superlative necessity of assuring to every citizen an equal opportunity of achieving the best education possible. The consciousness of the public to the gravity of this problem cannot be too strongly awakened. The lamp of learning must not be permitted to flicker. If it becomes extinguished, all our hopes and splendid dreams and our vision of a better life will fall into the abyss of darkness and futility. As we love our America, this must never happen.

### President Johnson's Position on Vietnam

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1965

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, in light of the continuing controversy over Vietnam, I insert in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Dallas Morning News on August 12, which deals with President Johnson's position on this subject:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Aug. 12, 1965]

#### PERSONAL REPORT: WASHINGTON

(By Robert E. Baskin, Chief)

President Johnson continues to explain and discuss his policies in Vietnam on any and all occasions, and there are those in Washington who believe he explains too much.

However, in the light of Hanoi's attitude about the conflict of southeast Asia, Mr. Johnson is well advised to make our intentions as clear as he possibly can.

Most great wars result from miscalculations.

On two occasions Germany misjudged the attitude of the American Nation on war in Europe. Japan, prior to World War II, also believed that the United States did not have the stamina to come back from a devastating blow to its Pacific possessions.

In these cases, the miscalculations were in large part created by the conduct of disident American citizens—the pacifists, the America Firsters, the militant pro-Nazi elements, the Communists, and all the others who created disturbances against U.S. support of the democracies of the world.

In the foreign press the activities of these organizations gave a distortion of the true sentiment of this Nation. In totalitarian lands it is hard to visualize such disturbances as may occur in a democracy, caused by tiny minorities, without coming to the conclusion that the Nation is badly divided on an issue.

This appears to be the case of the ruling circles of Communist North Vietnam today.

The men of Hanoi have taken note of the pacifist marchers at the White House and at the Capitol and the utterances of such newly emerged foreign policy experts as the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King and probably have decided that Mr. Johnson has a divided country on his hands.

This conclusion can only add to the determination of Ho Chi Minh to intensify this campaign against South Vietnam and, more important, take the risk of bringing on a major thermonuclear war.

Peiping, too, appears to be suffering under the delusion that the United States, as a whole, is somewhat reluctant about carrying on the war to preserve the independence of South Vietnam. The Red Chinese press has emphasized, in pictures and stories, the activities of the "peace at all costs" demonstrators in Washington and elsewhere.

The leaders of the Soviet Union probably have a more realistic appraisal of the situation in the United States, but they evidently are having a hard time talking realistically these days to Peiping and Hanoi.

How can the delusion be dispelled?

This is the problem that confronts Mr. Johnson. The administration knows full well that the erroneous beliefs in the southeast Asian Communist capitals must be eradicated to prevent miscalculation bringing on another great war.

Mr. Johnson has repeatedly stated that the American Nation is solidly behind our policies in Vietnam, and there has been every reason to believe that this is true.

But only this week radicals marched on the Capitol and created a disturbance that got bigger headlines abroad than Mr. Johnson's own statements about American policy and determination.

Mr. Johnson has just concluded a new round of briefings for Congress, and these briefings were singularly free of dissent. Governors, businessmen, and other national leaders are being kept well advised of developments in Vietnam. The President seems determined to remove the chances for a devastating miscalculation.

But a small handful of the population continues to demonstrate and agitate against the Vietnam policy. These demonstrators have been treated so mildly in this National Capital that one can only wonder what kind of special privilege they enjoy. Ordinary citizens cannot lie down in White House driveways without fear of punishment. Ordinary citizens cannot storm the Capitol itself and receive such solicitude as the pacifists got this week before the police finally did crack down. Ordinary citizens cannot block traffic and the sidewalks without paying the penalty.

But the demonstrations—by strange misfits from our urban areas and certain universities—continue to go on. And Peiping and Hanoi watch and listen.

There is a question as to how long our national authorities can afford the luxury of extending privilege to these off-beat people.

### Federal Government and Maryland: Partners in Crime and Vice

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to tell the Members of this House about the combined ignorance of the Federal Government and the State of Maryland in keeping gambling in Mary-

land illegal and thus wide open for mob exploitation. Illegal gambling is a popular pastime in Maryland—and unfortunately its revenues are not going to the public treasury, but rather are going to finance a multitude of organized crime's enterprises.

The pari-mutuel turnover in Maryland last year came to \$212 million. Illegal gambling is far more significant in Maryland, just as it is nationally. Testimony before the McClellan committee in 1961 put off-track betting at \$50 billion a year nationally. Other estimates put off-track betting at about 40 percent of the national illegal gambling total. This would make illegal gambling of all kinds come to about \$120 billion a year in the United States. This figure, of course, represents total turnover—the same \$10 bill can be won and lost many times the same night, with no economic effect in the end if you break even, except the bit clipped off each time by the proprietor. On a population basis, Maryland's share of this national illegal gambling total comes to \$2.16 billion annually. This may be a very good estimate. Ten years ago, the Massachusetts Crime Commission, in pegging Massachusetts' gambling at about the same figure, said that citizens of that State spend more on gambling than on groceries. Perhaps the same is true of Maryland. There is no doubt that illegal gambling is big business in Maryland's southern counties. Inasmuch as the mob gets to keep about 10 percent of the total turnover as profit, Maryland may be a \$200 million a year tidewater treasure chest for the organized crime empires.

The way to take gambling revenues away from organized crime and put them to work for the people is a national lottery. Only Government-run gambling can be trusted to keep the profits of the gambling urge in public hands for public tasks. The European experience has shown how the lottery represents social and financial commonsense. America needs a national lottery as soon as possible.

### Project Head Start

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in its first 3 months of operation, the Office of Economic Opportunity announced 260 projects which have affected every State in the Nation. One of these programs, Project Head Start, has been subjected to even more severe criticism than have the other programs. Apparently our ultraconservative friends would much rather wait for the deprived children involved in this program to grow into adulthood. Then the problem could be dealt with by expanding our law enforcement agencies and penal institutions.

Recently the Des Moines Register carried a letter from my good friend, Mrs.



A4900

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 31, 1965

Elizabeth Richards, of Red Oak, Iowa, replying to one such criticism. I herewith submit this letter for the benefit of my colleagues. You will note that Mrs. Richard's sophistication on this matter stands as evidence of the fact that her own community is not lacking in strong and practical leadership.

The letter follows:

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, July 28, 1965]

**MAKES REPLY TO LETTER ON HEAD START TO THE EDITOR:**

Iowans have a great newspaper in the Register. Your reporting and presentation are outstanding for fairness. As a supporter of President Johnson's programs under our Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as one vitally insistent on creating respect for this evolutionary piece of legislation, I thank you for Open Forum's July 18 letter from Dr. Robinson critical of the preschool Project Head Start and for the short enthusiastic letter printed immediately under it sent by the lady from Thornton who is actually working in the project.

I wish only one word could have been different in that lady's testimonial letter. She called it "the Government's Project Head Start" instead of "our Government's Project Head Start." The success or failure of these programs is to be sure in our own local communities independent of, though cooperating with, consultants and experts in Washington and Des Moines.

Dr. Robinson failed to note that school board members alone cannot accept or reject the programs. Responsibility for beginning this program will rest with officially designated community action agencies. Local citizens from many segments of a community must plan together with their own experts how much or how little of the Federal financial or technical aid their community wants.

There will be little chance for power-grabbing consultants in the education or any other professional field to take advantage of the Federal grants.

The cynical approach to the new Federal framework for breaking poverty cycles is one that foot-draggers and self-appointed experts often use. They dread change because new ideas and new people brought into the situation challenge their status as know-it-all experts.

Iowans ask facts from their newspapers and their leaders. They will then be prepared for change and will adapt it intelligently to their special needs.

Mrs. ELIZABETH RICHARDS.

## An Analysis of the Problem of Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON**  
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Tuesday, August 31, 1965

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the following analysis by Mr. L. W. Kern, president of the Maryland Highways Contractors Association, dealing with the whole problem of right to work is in the public interest.

Mr. Kern is a member of the board of directors of the contractors division, American Road Builders Association. He serves on their president's council and is vice chairman of their Bacon-

Davis watchdog committee. I am glad to include his analysis for the Record:

### THE PROBLEM OF RIGHT TO WORK

(An analysis by L. W. Kern, president, the Maryland Highways Contractors Association, Inc.)

On July 28 another step was taken in the plan, which step by step, can be seen unfolding. The House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States took its final action in one of the presently proposed two changes in labor legislation—it voted 221 to 203 to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

That act of retrogression seems to indicate that many people, including some Congressmen who voted for repeal, must have failed to realize certain significant facts.

It also warrants this supplement to our July 20 analysis: "A Stepping-Stone—Toward What?"

In weighing the pros and cons of the legislation which labor unions are demanding, it must be kept in mind that the labor unions of today are huge, powerful and especially-privileged private business enterprises, engaged in the profitable business of organizing the unorganized. The unorganized are the some 58 million workers (more than two-thirds of the Nation's workforce) who have not chosen, or as yet have not been forced, to become so organized.

### The Current Major Demands of Labor Unions

1. Labor unions are demanding the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. In other words, these private business enterprises are demanding (a) the nullification of certain legislation (right-to-work laws) which presently exists in more than a third of the States, (b) the taking away from all of the States the right to enact such legislation, and (c) the further expansion of their present exclusive privilege to practice discrimination in the area of employment.

2. Labor unions also are demanding the enactment of legislation (a so-called "sitius picketing" bill) which would give them the privilege to strike, picket and cause work stoppages at any construction site for the sole purpose of driving their competition (both nonunion and/or other unions) off the job without being in violation, as at present, of the secondary boycott. In other words, these private business enterprises are demanding the legalization of the privilege of using force (the awesome power of the picket-line with its obvious potential of causing emotional outbursts and violence) as a legitimate method of eliminating their competition and inflicting compulsory unionism upon the construction industry and its millions of employees.

### PART I—RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

*Right-to-work laws do not restrict any privilege which Federal law gives to workers*

1. Any worker today can join any labor union of his choice, which will accept him, without placing his employment in jeopardy.

2. A bare majority of the voting workers in an appropriate segment of their employer's personnel can vote into existence a collective bargaining unit, and elect the labor union of their choice as the exclusive representative of, and collective bargaining agent for, all the workers in said unit.

3. Workers can strike against and picket their employer for a wide variety of reasons.

*Right-to-work laws do not restrict labor unions in their federally granted privilege to solicit recognition and represent workers*

1. Labor unions can solicit either employers and employees to obtain their recognition of the labor union as the bargaining agent for the workers in question.

2. Labor unions so recognized henceforth are the exclusive representative of, and collective bargaining agent for, all of the employees in the designated collective bargain-

ing unit including (a) those employees who may have voted against such representation and (b) those employees who may not have had opportunity to vote, as would be the case when an employer, of his own volition or because of economic pressure, creates the collective bargaining unit. (Note: The privilege to speak for all was insisted upon by the labor unions, and contributes greatly to the prestige and political power wielded by these private business enterprises.)

*It is only in the two areas of "discrimination in employment" and "financial gain" that right-to-work laws limit the power of labor unions*

1. The Federal Government's laws and the edicts of its agencies permit these private business enterprises to require (in the absence of a State law to the contrary) the union shop in which employment is conditional upon membership in, and/or the payment of money to, the labor union.

2. To the contrary, right-to-work laws prohibit employment being made conditional upon membership or nonmembership in, and/or upon the payment or nonpayment of money to, a labor union.

### PART II—THE PROPOSED "SITUS PICKETING" LEGISLATION (LEGALIZED SECONDARY BOYCOTTS)

1. As noted in our basic analysis of July 20, labor unions have the right to picket any construction site for any purpose other than the outlawed secondary boycott and do so, therefore, it is obvious that these private business enterprises are attempting to have the Congress, in effect, legalize this crippling action in the construction industry.

2. It may well be that the AFL-CIO has grown weary of attempting to organize the unorganized of the construction industry by the legitimate and highly favorable means now available to all labor unions, or, that they are finding it increasingly difficult to sell their services to workers in these days of Davis-Bacon and other Federal wage controls. In any event, it is reasonable to assume, from the reliably reported statements of several of its high officials, that this labor union, a private business enterprise, intends to use the proposed legislation in an attempt (a) to eliminate its competition, both union and nonunion, (b) to enforce compulsory unionism, and, (c) to attain a monopoly of the construction industry.

3. District 50 (United Mine Workers of America) realizing that the proposed legislation would be detrimental to its individual interest, has opposed said legislation, however, District 50 frankly stated that it will withdraw its opposition if said legislation is amended to such an extent as to let it continue to be an illegal act to picket for the sole purpose of driving its affiliates off a job.

4. Secretary of Labor Wirtz was ill advised in saying that in the construction industry no one is an innocent bystander and that contractors know "whether union and non-union men are going to be drawn together and whether trouble will be the product of this mixed marriage." The very nature of construction work is conducive of such mixed marriages. Construction of public works projects is performed under contract provisions which prohibit any discrimination in the prequalification of bidders, and require that award be made to the lowest qualified bidder.

5. This proposed legislation undoubtedly will result in widespread, cleverly timed, and crippling strikes, picketing and work stoppages. Many imperative school, hospital, housing, highway, and other defense installation projects will be affected. Federal, State, county, and municipal construction time-tables, budget provisions and tax structures will be upset.

6. No construction, whether union or non-union, would be immune. But few contractors could financially survive the prolonged periods of enforced inactivity while labor



August 31, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4905

Mounting population precipitated an epidemic dispersal of San Geronio's wild life. Her two tiny lakes have all but gone dry.

Only one thing remains pretty much as it used to be in San Geronio's recorded history: Snow. The only mountain in southern California with a predictable ermine cloak, San Geronio remains the undoubted snow queen.

Write your Congressman.

### Blunting Vietcong's Goals

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOHN R. HANSEN**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as the ancient and familiar proverb goes: "Where there's life, there's hope."

Well, there is life—and vigor, and determination, and earnestness in this Nation's commitment to the struggle in South Vietnam. And today, it seems, there is hope.

The situation in that war-torn land is still grave and tragic. There is great loss of life, serious instability yet in the political structure of South Vietnam—and the continuing aggression of the Vietcong, supported by Communist strategists in Hanoi, remains a serious obstacle to peace there.

But, as the monsoon season draws to a close, American policymakers are finding encouragement in the fact that the expected Vietcong offensive was not as successful as it might have been. Our Marines have scored a great victory recently, and there is even some optimism that a hoped-for resolution in the conflict may be somewhat nearer.

This is slim encouragement for optimism but encouragement there can be hope, however fleeting, in the events of recent days.

I am happy to offer for inclusion in the Record an excellent editorial from the August 24 editions of the Mason City, Iowa, Globe Gazette. This editorial, entitled "Blunting Vietcong's Goals," briefly but competently sets forth some excellent thoughts on this matter:

#### BLUNTING VIETCONG'S GOALS

Vietnam still does not reflect a rosy picture. But perhaps there are faint, flickering signs of hope.

They're not much. But they are sufficient to permit a bit of optimism that the Communist-backed Vietcong will not achieve the victory they have striven for so hard during the rainy season—when the weather favors their kind of hit-and-run guerrilla warfare.

The fact is that the monsoon season is drawing to a close—only a few more weeks of drumming rain and overcast skies to go. The further fact is that while the Vietcong have hit South Vietnam hard, they have not knocked out the shaky government.

Another morale booster was the significant victory won by U.S. marines in what was the biggest single engagement of the conflict. Replacement of such high losses by infiltration will be slow and costly.

Nobody close to the scene believes that anything which has transpired to date will discourage the Communists from terminating the hostilities at this time.

But it does mean that the basic strategy

of keeping the South Vietnam Government as a political entity, while applying military pressure to show the Reds they cannot achieve victory on the battlefield, does appear to be working.

President Johnson's goal, of course, is to persuade the Communists that they must forego this battlefield and seek a solution at the conference table. But there still is no assurance this will be achieved after this rainy season—or even the next.

The United States will be in South Vietnam, expending lives and military assistance, for a long time to come. The successes and trends are still dwarfed by the massive setbacks during the last 2 years.

### Heraldry in America

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in a previous issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I inserted a most enlightening and interesting article by Mr. Fessel B. Koepnick on the subject of Heraldry. I am pleased to place in the Record another article by the same author:

#### HERALDRY IN AMERICA

(By Fessel B. Koepnick, Esq., Augustan Society, Heraldry Society)

Events of recent years, coupled with past American history, indicate a sooner or later surge in the interest of heraldry in America. Indeed, this interest has already materialized. As regards past American history let us admit that many if not the majority of the first leaders of our Republic were indeed armigerous, and many were directly descended from nobility, from President Washington onward, and including at least several of the group who landed at Plymouth Rock. And these many armigerous families have been regularly augmented through continuing immigration. In fact the backbone of leadership of our Republic is armigerous. Nonarmigerous persons know this, even though they also resent it. Nevertheless, these same persons themselves aspire to coat armor, and prove it by their enthusiastic though ignorant effort to acquire spurious or illegal so-called family name coats of arms. Thus, the net result of our now affluent society.

Sooner or later the matter is going to demand some kind of regulation and conformity. Our (successful) trademark, patents, and copyrights system prove this sufficiently. It also proves that the matter can be successfully regulated, although in a democracy without a fons honorum (fountain of honor) there is the ever-present danger of politics. Even in England, where the fountain of honor lies with the Sovereign, the "new society" has created a situation which comes dangerously close to politics. The College of Arms is firm and rigid in the regulation and control of heraldry by authority of the Sovereign, and has been for hundreds of years. Today the "commoner" who is not armigerous and who attempts to secure a grant of arms must conform to specific requirements including that of character. When the applicant is unable or unwilling to do so he immediately screams foul and if he has any influence with certain nonarmigerous politicians, one can imagine the turmoil. Such is the ever-present danger. But, like any other worthy effort, this must be continued with successfully.

The events of recent years actually go back to the early 1920's the period after World War I, when the Government created the Institute of Heraldry as a department within the U.S. Army. One would get the impression that this agency is purely military and is purely Army. The facts are not entirely such. The Institute of Heraldry is responsible for designing, matriculating, issuing, recording and authorizing blazons for any and all Government agencies, bureaus and departments, including the Army and the Air Force and even the Navy. Consequently, persons interested in heraldry in America should not take this agency lightly. While they have made many mistakes through the years they have not been serious, and are attributable entirely to the limited experience of early personnel.

Actually, the father of American (military) heraldry was Col. Robert E. Wylie, a coast artillery officer who contributed several articles around 1923. From that period, there has been possibly some 10,000 distinctive insignia made and used by various Army units. Admittedly, of this number many were errors. Errors in design, manufacture, tinctures and shape. As time passed, many units disbanded, reconstituted, reassigned, redesignated, and many even retired. And the Institute of Heraldry is busier today than ever before because the American Army is in a very fluid state of continuing change and reorganization. Mounted (horse) cavalry has become armored units; infantry has become airborne; armored; rangers; special forces (guerrilla); coast artillery went to antiaircraft and now to missiles, and many, many other such changes. Many units became "cadres" for the creation of entirely new units.

As a result, the new unit inherited the blazon of its parent and in some instances the English system of cadency was used, in others the Scottish cadency was used. Canting is used to admirable success. Symbols meaningfully used and in regulatory order. Tinctures concur with the colors of the branch of arm and/or service, and in canting as well. The institute encourages the fantastic variation of shapes of the shields which attempt to make each insignia exactly that which it is called, that is, distinctive.

All of which indicates the ability of the Institute of Heraldry, and the necessity of all heraldic minded persons and organizations to seek some means of liaison with the agency. If any effort of our own is to be successful in our endeavor, then we must go along with these people. At the moment they are not inclined toward specific relations with organizations or individuals outside of government. Our success in establishing contact, relations, and communications with this group of personnel will probably have to be a result of our ability to do so through our elected Congress and Senate. The time is at hand to begin such an effort. The effort may succeed moreso if we can locate and engender interest with armigerous Congressmen. But perhaps like a late President who was indeed of an armigerous family, his greatest effort and personal success was the result of his urgent denial of his noble heritage, many politicians will never admit that they are other than descendants of immigrant serfs. Most Americans still glory in claiming birth in an imaginative log cabin.

Most Americans are not armigerous. Yet if an applicant, if of good character, he should be able to engage the services of a competent herald who will honestly design the appropriate blazon for him. It should be registered under his State trademark or patent laws. If some national system can be created, the registry should lie within such central agency. The net effect of this effort would be the elimination of the present houses who peddle spurious and illegal coat armor to gullible individuals may of whom honestly are seeking an individual blazon.

A4906

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 31, 1965

# The Lynch Trial of Marcos Perez Jimenez

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to include an article by Harold Lord Varney, who is president and founder of the Committee on Pan American Policy. As such, he has been in the forefront of the fight to induce Washington to wage an all-out battle against communism in Latin America. Formerly the political editor of American Mercury, he was also adviser to the Republic of China between 1947 and 1948.

At the time Perez Jimenez was scheduled for deportation, I lodged a vigorous protest with the Department of State against this atrocious procedure. Deportation had been authorized by the U.S. Supreme Court, but the final power lay in the hands of the Secretary of State.

This was the first time in the history of this country that deportation was permitted involving a political exile who had been a former head of state of the country to which he was being returned.

Perez Jimenez was sold into bondage in exchange for a mess of pottage which quickly soured. This inhuman act by the Kennedy administration will forever be a black mark against the self-proclaimed high ideals of that administration.

The article follows:

#### VENEZUELA: THE LYNCH TRIAL OF MARCOS PEREZ JIMENEZ

I left the plane at Maiquetia. After 3 years, I was back in Venezuela.

Naturally, I was greatly curious to see the changes which had taken place in that fabulously rich country. My last sight of Venezuela had been in the glooming months of the Presidency of Marcos Perez Jimenez, just before the Leftist revolution which brought Romulo Betancourt back to power. I had carried away a vivid impression of a country bursting with progress under the driving leadership of the man who has been recognized, even by his adversaries, as one of the great Latin American builders of modern times. What, I thought, had the Betancourt-Leoni regime done to top Perez Jimenez? How had the government's annual flow of \$700 million in oil royalties been spent to improve Venezuela?

My interest had been whetted by the news, just before I left New York, that the Leoni regime had petitioned the United States for permission to sell \$15 million worth of Venezuelan bonds on the American market. Was it possible that the Betancourt-Leoni Accion Democratica Party was conducting such a massive public improvement program that it had overextended itself?

My cab swept me over the magnificent Autopista toward the capital. That beautifully engineered highway, literally carved through the mountains, was planned and built by Perez Jimenez. I asked the driver to continue along San Martin Boulevard where the 30-story twin towers of the Centro Bolivar command the Caracas landscape—another of Perez Jimenez' projects,

cut through the hovels and slums that formerly filled the heart of the Venezuelan capital. In the distance was the imposing Central University, surrounded by its beautiful university city—now a forbidding nest of Communist student terrorism. The university complex, once a great center of learning, had also been conceived and built by President Perez. In the far distance were the forty 15-story apartment houses constructed by Perez Jimenez to provide inexpensive housing for the people of Caracas.

We swung onto the stately Eastern Highway, an eight-lane elevated boulevard which led to my hotel; that highway too was a monument to the constructive determination of Marcos Perez Jimenez. I reached the Tamanaco, one of the great hotels of South America, to be told that it had also been planned and built by the government of President Perez.

It was saddening to realize that the architect of all of these public works was now lying in a Caracas prison, on trial before his political enemies and thus forced to face the usual barrage of political accusations.

A good rule to follow when seeking information in a Latin American city is to ask the taxi driver.

"Where are some of the buildings which have been put up by Betancourt and Leoni? I asked innocently.

The driver treated me to one of those characteristic Latin shrugs, "Nada," he answered, "nothing. Too many hands."

Obviously, the "hands" he had in mind were those which deliver the democratic vote to the Betancourt-Leoni twosome. Later, when I was told the facts about the great armies of leftist, Communist, and dead-beat henchmen who have been glued into fictitious government jobs, I began to more fully understand where the annual \$700 million in oil royalties had gone. I learned that since the exit of President Perez the public payroll had snowballed from 900 million bolivars per year to a present total of 3 billion bolivars. A lot of democratic votes can be kept in line with that kind of money.

Of course, the Accion Democratica, when it talks to Americans, has an alibi: Betancourt hasn't built public works in Caracas because he is spending money in rural Venezuela on agrarian reform. I recalled President Kennedy's visit to the model agrarian community of La Merita in 1961, when he shouted glowingly that Venezuela under Betancourt, with its agrarian reform, was giving an example for all Latin America to follow. I asked one of my friends to drive me out to La Merita so that I could check the progress.

"La Merita," my friend bellylaughed, "there is no La Merita. It was closed after Kennedy left, when everybody moved away." The whole agrarian exhibit, it seemed, had been only a plant to fool a checkwriting and impressionable young President into believing that a great agrarian program was underway.

All of this was not, of course, surprising; for anti-Communist President Perez Jimenez's successors—Romulo Betancourt, and his long-time secretary, Raul Leoni—are not the sort of men who see anything wrong in employing graft and fraud if something is to be had in the process for their comrades of the left. Remember that Betancourt, despite his honorary degree from Harvard, his coming lecture series at UCLA, and his strange favor with American liberals, was one of the founders of the Venezuelan Communist Party; that he was exiled for his Communist Party activity in 1928, whereupon he went to Costa Rica to co-found the Costa Rican Communist Party with Manuel Mora Valverde (his brother-in-law). Remember, too, that it was Betancourt who provided the credentials that got Communist Fidel Castro into and out of Bogota in 1942, when Castro was one of the leaders of the famous Communist butchery of Bogota.

And we remember Betancourt's statement,

from the notorious Barranquilla letters authenticated by the U.S. military attaché at Caracas: "With vaseline we may be able to insert into the people all of Marx and all of Lenin."

Remember, too, his published letters of the late thirties, when he wrote for publication in La Hora of Costa Rica: "It doesn't mean that I deny my Communist affiliation. I am and I will be a Communist." Or the Betancourt letter of September 25, 1934, which he published in a San Jose newspaper, in which he said: "I am and always have been a Communist." Or his letter of February 15, 1937, published in a Caracas newspaper: "It is very urgent to determine that the necessary revolution for transforming Venezuela only can succeed if it is conducted, led, and centralized by the Venezuelan Communist Party."

Today, few will doubt, Romulo Betancourt is being more clever about his leftist activity. It is as he wrote to his accomplice Raul Leoni in one of the captured Barranquilla letters: "In case there is any misunderstanding, let me point out to you here, publicly and openly that I have been called a Communist. But I think we should act in a little more foxy way at this time to win what we need."

And, what Betancourt and Leoni need they try to get—through fraud, deceit, terror, or anything else handy at the moment. They now need to rid themselves of the threat of anti-Communist Marcos Perez Jimenez. But we will have a great deal more to say of that later in this article.

I

Throughout my visit to Venezuela, the impression grew that I was in a country in decadence. Venezuela touched greatness for a brief moment in the 1950's, before the men of the left had moved in. Now it is no longer advancing. It is living upon the fruits of its past, while the Accion Democratica plunderblund frantically clutches power and all its emoluments. The mainstream of the nation's economy is stagnant.

Of course, no such picture of Venezuela has penetrated the United States. Popular articles in the American press, as well as the fervid speeches of HUBERT HUMPHREY, are forever full of aside references to Betancourt's having cleaned up the mess left by Perez Jimenez. To read the highly colored stories of democratic progress in Venezuela under Romulo Betancourt, one gets the concept of a nation humming with achievement and purpose. Unhappily, there is no such Venezuela. Like La Merita, such descriptive prose is a Potemkin exhibit, thrown up by the Accion Democratica and its glibble and leftist American friends, to convince the United States that Venezuela, under the left, has made more progress than under the right. The Venezuelan people are not impressed by such hogwash. They know the bitter truth.

Even in stately Caracas, the scars of the Accion Democratica years are plainly visible. I was driven out to see the shanty towns which ring the city and which shelter the unfortunates who are not sharing in the Accion Democratica perquisites. Under Perez Jimenez, an energetic housing program was rapidly eliminating this nightmare. In Perez's last year, after great effort, he had been able to reduce the hovels to five thousand dwellings. Now, after 6 years of Betancourt and Leoni, they have increased to 100,000—with more appearing daily.

Throughout Venezuela a strangling unemployment stalks the country. There had been virtually no unemployment in 1957 when I was there before, yet the latest figures disclose that there are now some 550,000 unemployed. If the United States, with its greater population, had the same ratio of jobless to population, we would have in our midst a desperate army of 11,500,000 citizens without jobs—almost the maximum high in our great depression. And, because of its great birthrate, 70,000 new potential Vene-

August 31, 1965

creepers rear from the flower beds, making a cool interlocking ceiling against the fierce sun. Pagodas, scattered throughout the grounds, give restful spots for leisure and conversation.

Reclining in a hammock in one of these pagodas, Naranjo talked to me about the case. He has no doubt that he will win it, despite the stacked deck which confronts him in the supreme court. He bases his defense upon the obvious illegality of a political trial for an extradited former president, under the terms of the Venezuela-United States Extradition Treaty. Moreover, he cites the fact that the Venezuelan constitution of 1953 (operative during Perez Jimenez's presidency) specifically prohibits persecution for crimes committed by a president in the practice of his public functions. Unless the court is ready to hand down a kangaroo decision, Naranjo is confident that the law of Venezuela stops Lazada at every point.

Of course, there can be no illusion that this is other than a political trial. Had Perez Jimenez been willing to come to terms with the ruling leftists, as Pietri and Lopez Contreras have done, he would be a free man today. The left always has an open gate for apostates. But in the tough Andean nature of Perez Jimenez there is no touch of the apostate. He will fight on, at all costs, because he believes that he is right. He also believes fixedly that anti-communism, and not the Betancourt brand of crypto-communism, is the wave of Venezuela's future.

Of course, the outcome hangs heavily upon public opinion, both in Venezuela and in the United States. The Leonil government wants desperately to liquidate Perez Jimenez; but it does not dare risk a judicial crime in the revealing glare of publicity now beating upon the case. In Venezuela, the balance of public sympathy has already swung heavily against the Accion Democratica course. Accion Democratica is straining upon the limits of the possible.

Meanwhile, in the United States, the pro-Betancourt bias of most of our press has refrained from giving the American people any clear knowledge of what is taking place in the Caracas courtroom, and of its likely historic consequences. Our leftists have done a thorough propaganda job about Venezuela under the Accion Democratica. So all-out is the press buildup of Romulo Betancourt that even some active American conservatives hesitate to stand up and be counted on the Betancourt issue. They rationalize their position by saying: "Betancourt has fought the Communists"—disregarding the open fact that he has fought only his propaganda rival, Fidel Castro, while advancing his own brand of "communism under another name" with impunity. The liberals have profited richly from this induced confusion on the part of the right. With the late John F. Kennedy, they have made Betancourt's name so holy that no writer who wants to make a living dares to attack him. And yet, Betancourt and his Accion Democratica must be X-rayed and exposed to the American people if there is ever to be reason in our Latin American policy.

While I was in Venezuela, I was horrified to read that at that very moment Betancourt was being honored in New York by an organization whose leaders bristle with those cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities for association with subversive efforts, and that the President of the United States, himself, had sent a letter to the dinner eulogizing Betancourt. It was poetic justice that, after the President had made such a gesture, Betancourt insolently tossed off a speech savagely attacking the Johnson intervention in the Dominican Republic. It is such an incident as this, blackly headlined in the pro-Betancourt press in Caracas, that gives the fading Accion Democratica a continued lease of prestige in Venezuela. Today, Accion Democratica's greatest asset is the impression that Washington is be-

hind it. The Johnson administration's continuing policy of support for Betancourt needs to be stopped. It is alienating non-leftist Venezuelans. It is intervention in its most unprofitable form in the politics of a sensitive country.

Perez Jimenez, the hounded prisoner in the Caracas courtroom, is undoubtedly the political key to Venezuela's future. In the last 3 years he has looked into the very mouth of hell, and he has not flinched. He looms today as the one possible leader who can spark a hemispheric swing to the anti-Communist right. He has been smeared unmercifully, and he is still being smeared. His enemies dismiss him as a playboy, despite his unrivaled achievements. True, he has none of the dour and unsmiling solemnity with which a Betancourt has impressed an anemic American intelligentsia. Perez Jimenez is a lover of life, who lives by the code of his lusty Andean heritage, and millions of Latin Americans love him for it—for that and for his anti-communism.

In his present exposed situation, it is the duty of every anti-Communist American to try to save him. His own Venezuelan people are trying courageously to pull him out of the leftist jaws. With Naranjo's eloquent voice on their side, they may succeed in doing it on their own. But it would be a melancholy spectacle, at this juncture, if American anti-Communists failed to come to the support of one who is so conspicuously fighting the anti-Communist battle in Venezuela.

Thanks to a thoroughly dishonest press coverage, many misinformed American conservatives are today unknowingly cheering for the Venezuelan left. The press blackout is pervasive. Unless it is answered and defeated, it will help to kill the spirit of anti-communism in Venezuela. The long-range American anti-Communist purpose has suffered so many withering defeats in late years that it cannot afford another disaster. It would be a shameful epitaph upon today's America to be remembered as the nation which rescued a Romulo Betancourt when his own people were ready to spew him out.

## Vietnam and the Long View

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an article written by Emmett Dedmon, executive editor of the Chicago Sun-Times, after a recent extensive tour he made of southeast Asia. I feel this article merits the particular attention of the Members of Congress because it presents a whole new outlook and a refreshing long-range view of the chances for achieving our goal of peace, not only in Vietnam, but in all of Asia.

Mr. Dedmon has returned from his tour with the conviction that Vietnam represents a defensible position for the United States but that "we should not delude ourselves that it constitutes a policy for Asia." He points out that East and West have different histories, different cultures, and in some cases different values, making it difficult to achieve a meeting of the minds as quickly as we in the West hope to achieve it. The eastern view appears to be that it will

take at least "10 years or so" before a significant thaw in relations between the United States and Red China can be expected.

It is encouraging to learn from Dedmon's report that the predominant feeling in southeast Asia is that the U.S. presence in Vietnam is not generally regarded as a colonial or oppressive enterprise.

Mr. Dedmon tells us that the southeast Asian countries feel the U.S. program would be more effective if it were identified with long-range social reforms. It is to this end that consideration is being given by the United States to establishing an Asiatic Bank and Edward Lansdale has been assigned to Vietnam to help develop a Government structure capable of bringing about this social reform.

The article by Mr. Dedmon, which appeared in the Sun-Times on August 29, 1965, follows:

On a wall at Angkor Wat, the great temple in Cambodia constructed from the 9th to the 12th century, there is a mural showing Khmer (Cambodian) soldiers fighting off an invading band of Chams, one of the tribes who eventually came to be known as the Vietnamese.

"Yes," said our Cambodian guide with no trace of rancor, "the Vietnamese people have always caused difficulties in Asia far out of proportion to their numbers."

Thus it was on a green plateau in Cambodia, far removed from any evidence of contemporary civilization, that I found what was to be the most relevant commentary during a summer's pilgrimage to southeast Asia in search of answers about Vietnam.

Purposefully, I had avoided Vietnam except for two brief interludes between airplanes in Saigon. For I was not interested in the war, which is in Vietnam, but in the prize of peace, which is all of Asia.

As I left the United States early in July, the debate over our policy in Vietnam was raging louder and louder; and, it seemed, to me, at a frenetic pitch hardly conducive to sensible meditation about long-range goals of foreign policy.

It was a relief, then, to find that the din of the dispute decreased in almost direct proportion to our approach to Vietnam.

Asia has a long history in which war has never been as neatly codified as we in the West have done in order to bring orderliness to the teaching of history. As you stand in Asia, you begin to understand that it would never occur to the leaders of these ancient peoples that any solution would be sought as quickly as was being demanded in the United States or Western Europe.

Asia is a land of ancient quarrels. Cambodia, for example, which recently broke off relations with the United States has even greater animosity toward its neighbor nation of Thailand. And Cambodia's dispute with Vietnam is grounded more substantially in disagreement over borders resulting from the historic surge of armies than in ideological differences with the South Vietnam Government.

All these nations recognize both tacitly and explicitly the American presence in Vietnam as a buffer against territorial encroachment by China. And they fear China the nation much more than China the harbinger of international communism.

Many of these peoples trace their ancestry to early incursions of armies from China. It is clear that they regard those periods when Western powers served as a buffer to the giant from the north to be centuries as near to tranquility as any they have known.

From their point of view, then, the stalemate in South Vietnam is much to be pre-



zuelan workers are reaching working age every year, to swell the problem. The Accion Democratica has no jobs for them.

These grim but inescapable facts have now worn off the phony luster of the Betancourt regime. The Venezuelan public is fed up with the Accion Democratica and its moist and empty promises. At the last election, Raul Leoni barely squeaked through, with but 32 percent of the vote. He rules today only through a coalition of unstable splinter parties, known as the *Amplia Base*. Betancourt discreetly stays in New York, where he is lapping up the sort of lionization from American liberals and leftists that he no longer receives in Venezuela. He is also consulted by President Johnson.

Surely, even the merest tyro can detect in today's Venezuela the unmistakable signs of the profound political crisis ahead. If it comes, it will be the first important instance of a nation, which has been taken over totally by the Left, returning by popular choice to the anti-Communist right.

II

The above supplies a revealing backdrop to the insane performance which is now being staged before the Supreme Court of Venezuela—the attempt to railroad Marcos Perez Jimenez to a prison term on a manufactured charge of corruption. Such an attempt to immobilize and discredit Perez Jimenez, and to thus remove him from politics, is the last desperate gamble of Betancourt and his weak understudies (Raul Leoni, Jovito Villalba, and Rafael Caldera) to stave off Venezuela's swing to the right. Perez Jimenez is the only Venezuelan anti-Communist of stature who is capable of leading a successful movement against the leftist incompetents. The word is out that he must be destroyed, and now.

The former President would not be in a prison cell today if it were not for the interference of the United States. An exile in Miami, Perez Jimenez was caught in the swirl of the ill-advised intrigues between President Kennedy and Romulo Betancourt in 1961-63. It is nearly certain that President Kennedy on the occasion of Betancourt's visit to the White House during February of 1963, promised to deliver Perez Jimenez to Betancourt on condition that Betancourt aid the United States against Castro. Since Betancourt was Castro's former teacher and sponsor, this was a clever dodge. The promise was purportedly given even before the courts had acted, and in shameless disregard of the hitherto unbreached American tradition of political asylum. For 2 years, after the extradition, the former President lay in a Caracas prison. His trial opened on April 9.

It is important to understand that in the eyes of the Venezuelan public the corruption charge has placed upon Perez Jimenez little or no moral stigma. Latin Americans are used to the mutual bandying of accusations of corruption when governments fall. In the case of Betancourt and the Accion Democratica, the cry of corruption is an old gambit. Certainly Perez Jimenez is not the first victim of Betancourt's false charges of corruption. Romulo has tried it before.

Back in 1945, when the Accion Democratica won its first term of power, Romulo Betancourt followed his victory by indicting two former Presidents of Venezuela—Eliazar Lopez Contreras and Isaias Angarita—for misuse of funds. With them in the dock was a third defendant, Usiar Pietri. They were found guilty and their property confiscated. When Perez Jimenez and the military triumvirate came to power in 1948, although there were copious grounds for similar accusations against the deposed Accion Democratica leaders, it was decided to end this vicious circle of persecution of political adversaries, and no charges were made against Betancourt. The confiscated property was restored to Betancourt's three victims.

How lightly Betancourt actually holds his charges of corruption is shown by the fact that Usiar Pietri, one of the 1945 defendants, was taken into the Leoni cabinet in 1964, and former President Lopez Contreras is now a highly honored exhibit at all current Accion Democratica public functions in Caracas.

It appears, however, that Betancourt has made a major mistake in extraditing and placing Perez Jimenez on trial. He has dangerously miscalculated Venezuelan public opinion. Instead of discrediting Perez Jimenez, the persecution has martyred him. A wave of personal sympathy for the former President swept over the country while he was being held in prison. Coinciding with the national mood of disillusionment with Betancourt, this mounting pro-Perez Jimenez feeling suddenly became a political force. It has now begun to panic the leftists.

The dam broke on April 9, the day Perez Jimenez was brought from prison to court. A miracle occurred. An unorganized and spontaneous outburst of support for Perez rocked Caracas. Sympathizers appeared with brooms and hoses to cleanse the streets over which his car would pass on the way to the Supreme Court building. Thousands lined the sidewalks. Women and children threw flowers at the general's car. A roar of "Viva Perez Jimenez" broke from thousands of throats. It was the unexpectedness of the demonstration that made it so strikingly important. It was as if multitudes of people, who had silently endured the privations and sufferings of the Accion Democratica years, had at last found their collective voice and were calling for the return of the President under whom life had been better.

The Accion Democratica regime immediately realized the importance of stopping this popular outburst before it endangered their dictatorship. The second day, the approaches to the supreme court were sealed off by a deep line of armed troops. Passes were required for entrance, and applicants were screened. A score or so of Perez Jimenez's followers were placed under arrest to frighten the demonstrators. Even one of the Perez Jimenez lawyers, Rafael Perez Perdoma, was placed under temporary arrest. The intimidation went further. A Caracas TV station was courageous enough to place a strong supporter of Perez Jimenez, Erwin Burguera, on the air to present the Perez case. Burguera was seized by the police and held in prison for 47 days.

The press was also intimidated. The influential *Capriles* newspapers had demanded the liberation of the former President. As a result, Miguel Capriles, the editor of *La Esfera*, was arrested and charged with anti-government activities, and proceedings were instituted to abrogate the parliamentary immunity of one of his editors. To hurt the *Capriles* press in the pocket book, the Government next indicated to the big American oil companies that it would be to their advantage to withdraw their advertising from *Capriles*. To the shame of America, all complied.

But these awful events were overshadowed by the public registering of names of Venezuelan citizens demanding Perez Jimenez's liberation. Friends of the former President circulated petitions throughout the country. In order to avoid the suspicion of fraud, all signers were asked to affix their identity numbers—a dangerous step in a country which is a quasi-police state. These names were printed in full-page advertisements in *La Esfera* and other newspapers. To date, approximately 50,000 such signatures have been obtained and published. They are still pouring in at a mounting rate.

When we examine the published names, another surprising fact strikes us. Although the names of some distinguished persons appear, these are not predominantly the Venezuelan elite. Nor are they former jobholders under the Perez administration. For the most part, they are the names of ordinary

nonpolitical citizens who have had enough of Accion Democratica. It is the voice of a broad cross section of the Venezuelan people. One highly significant appearance among the petitions is a list of 8,000 trade unionists. When, realizes that Betancourt and his agents control the Venezuelan unions with an iron hand, such a defection is symptomatic.

III

Against such a setting, the question assails us: Can Perez Jimenez secure a fair trial in the Betancourt courts? Is there a hope of acquittal? Here we find ourselves in the world of surmise. Let us look at the mise en scene before which the trial is taking place.

The Supreme Court of Venezuela, which is sitting in full to hear this historic case, is stacked with Perez Jimenez's political enemies. It is ironic that, although the stately supreme court building was erected by Perez Jimenez, none of his adherents are on the bench. It is a court which has been made over and handpicked by the leftist regimes which have held power since his departure.

The president of the supreme court, Hugo Ardilla Bustamante, is an undisguised Accion Democratica politician. He was the chairman of the independent committee for Raul Leoni in the 1963 presidential election, despite the strict law that justices of the supreme court may not engage in partisan politics. Another justice is Gonzalo Barrios, whose brother is minister of the interior in Leoni's cabinet. He controls the political police. Perez Jimenez's counsel, Dr. Rafael Naranjo Ostty, after persistent efforts, has succeeded in disqualifying two or three justices who have been particularly virulent in their anti-Perez Jimenez bias. But others remain.

The atmosphere in the courtroom is indicated by an occurrence on the first day of the trial. A woman rose from the spectators' seats and interrupted the proceedings with a screaming outburst of obscenities directed at the seated Perez Jimenez. When she was quieted, it was discovered that she was the sister of Cesar Tinoco Richor, one of the Justices on the bench. Although, under Venezuelan law, her offense called for a prison sentence of 8 days, she was released without charges.

The prime exhibit of bias in the case is Attorney General Jose Antonio Lazada, who is prosecuting the *fusco*. Lazada envisages himself as a sort of native Vishinsky, who will come out of the trial with the laurels of a hanging prosecutor. He has reason to hate Perez Jimenez. During the latter's Presidency, Lazada held a minor position under him as consultant of prisons. When it was discovered that he was spending his time working for the leftist Accion Democratica, Perez Jimenez fired him. Lazada anticipates his revenge in this trial.

But Perez Jimenez also holds an ace card in the trial. He is being defended by Venezuela's outstanding advocate, Rafael Naranjo Ostty. If Lazada looms as the Vishinsky of the trial, Naranjo comes as an unpolitical Clarence Darrow of the Venezuelan bar. All his life, Naranjo has fought brilliantly for unpopular causes. As a youth he was imprisoned and tortured by Dictator Gomez for his defense of union labor. An unpolitical figure, he had no acquaintance with Perez Jimenez while the latter was President. But when Perez approached him to be his defender, he was so impressed by the palpable injustice of the legal trap which Betancourt has contrived that he offered to plead the case without a fee. The clash of two such contrasting advocates gives moving drama to the courtroom scene.

I visited Naranjo in his unique Shangri-la home in the heart of the Caracas business district. Here, too, are his offices. One enters a grilled gate from the crowded street and finds himself in a tropical retreat. Scores of toucans and other rare birds of bright plumage, in their cages, fill the paths with sound. Giant royal palms, heavy with

August 31, 1965

A4909

ferred to any quick solution which might lead to an American withdrawal.

The nations of the West, preoccupied with their own diplomatic and policy objectives, often forget that these smaller nations have objectives and historic thrusts of their own.

As Mark Gayn observed in these pages a few weeks ago: "Asia is now in the throes of the biggest revolution in history. At its heart lies man's protest against the feudal yesterday and the hungry today. This revolution will last for decades and will envelop most of the countries that lie between the longitude of Moscow and Peking."

Certainly the people of these nations in the "third Asia" between China and India have much more to fear from the familiar specter of hunger than from the incomprehensible patterns of atomic war.

When Western diplomats speak of the so-called domino theory which suggests all these nations will promptly "fall" if the United States should withdraw from Vietnam, they merely perpetuate a myth of uniformity where there is really diversity.

Although it may not seem so in the light of the test of strength between the great powers, it is paradoxically true that a continuing American commitment in Vietnam is bringing to Asia more stability than instability.

These are nations whose great cities have made miraculous postwar leaps directly into the booming economy of the mid-20th century. The tourist in these cities finds himself constantly among wide expressways and avenues, traffic jams (many of them with two-wheeled vehicles predominant), neon signs and air-conditioned office buildings.

Though the rural areas still struggle with the slow gait of the water buffalo and centuries-old techniques of farming, they are gradually (excluding India and Indonesia) beginning to rise above the level of bare subsistence. The women, who have borne the loads of these nations on their backs and in their hands, have even found time to fill the open windows of their shuttered huts with such frills as brightly colored curtains.

These people, for whom the material benefits of the modern world are at last beginning to be dimly discernible, obviously don't want the war to be brought into their own rice paddies. But neither do they find anything in the present situation to suggest that the American war effort in Vietnam is in any sense a colonial or oppressive enterprise.

In the Philippines, this view was reflected by Manila's Mayor Antonio J. Villegas, who had been a leader in the Philippine campaign to neutralize the rebellious Huks at a time when the Huks presented the same kind of threat that the Vietcong do in South Vietnam.

Villegas said there was very little real consciousness in the Philippines about our effort in Vietnam. He attributed the failure of the Philippine National Assembly to vote additional troops for Vietnam more to the fact this is a presidential election year than to any reluctance to support the American position.

However, Villegas felt that the U.S. program would be even more effective if it were identified with long-range social reforms rather than merely military objectives. This view, of course, is shared in Washington and presumably was behind the recent assignment of Edward Lansdale to Vietnam to help develop a viable governmental structure which might produce and offer such a program.

For his own part, Villegas expressed a willingness to establish a training program in the Philippines where South Vietnamese village and provincial leaders could be brought for a training institute that would (1) indicate how the Philippines dealt successfully with the Huks and (2) help train leaders so government could be effective at the local level in Vietnam.

Leaders in other countries echoed this need for an identifiable social program (from

the Vietnamese Government as distinguished from the U.S. aid program for southeast Asia).

Everywhere there was pessimism about the possibility of early negotiations to end the fighting in Vietnam. But if there was pessimism, there was no sense of doom about such a delay.

No one with whom I talked expected that Ho Chi Minh would be persuaded to come to the conference table for a period of months—or until he was convinced that the United States had the patience and determination to stay in Vietnam. They look upon our increasing troop commitments and aggressive tactics in Vietnam, not as many American intellectuals do as a threat to war, but as the only way to the conference table.

At the same time, they talked about "10 years or so" as the period which would probably be required before there was any significant thaw in the relations between the United States and Red China. Nor did this seem to alarm any of China's neighbors. In Asia, one was reminded again, they have always been inclined to bet on the tortoise and not on the hare.

This suggestion that the solution in Vietnam is still months away in no way minimizes the American agony over the presence there of our troops or the dangers of an escalated war.

Freedom has always required such commitments of this Nation, however. We should not lose sight of the fact we are fighting not to impose our will on others but to assure a climate in a world grown small that will permit our free institutions to survive.

For this reason, it is doubly important that we do not become so obsessed with extracting ourselves from an unhappy position in Vietnam that we forget our objectives. Those objectives will not be served if we fail to provide for the development of a sound civilian government in Vietnam during any armistice or if we fail to begin a review of our whole Asian policy.

As Bill Mauldin suggested in a cartoon last Sunday (and reproduced today) China's ultimatums may be 10 or 20 years in the making. Our responses and plans should be no less deliberate.

Another discovery of the visitor to Asia (who is willing to listen) is that the competition among these countries is not geared to Vietnam at all but to the developing Afro-Asian sense of community.

It is not without significance that in most of the areas we visited—the Philippines, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Cambodia, Hong Kong, Japan—discussion of the future political course of these countries began with the mention of the proposed Algiers conference last June.

In the United States we had a tendency to treat Algiers as a strictly monolithic Red Chinese propaganda show. Certainly that was what Red China hoped it to be.

But many of the Afro-Asian nations who had first met at Bandung in Indonesia in 1955 for what President Sukarno grandly called the first intercontinental conference of colored peoples in the history of mankind had different ideas. They were hoping to find their own arena for international recognition and development independent of the great power struggle.

When, earlier this year, the Algiers conference was being organized, Albert Ravenholt wrote in the Chicago Daily News that "the stakes are considerably higher than perhaps is appreciated in Washington, London, or Paris."

The Chinese Communists were hoping to use it to attack both the United States and the Soviet Union. (They had even hoped to exclude the Soviet Union—a rather bold gesture at a meeting representing Asia, for Russia's portion of Asia is second only to China's.)

The other nations, however, wanted the

meeting to be one where they could talk at least in part about their mutual problems of poverty, land reform, and mechanization for their archaic industries and agriculture.

Fortuitously, Ahmed Ben Bella was ousted as President of Algeria in June while most of the delegates were en route to the conference and at a time when the machinery of the conference was very much under Red China's control.

In what is now regarded as an abrupt diplomatic defeat for Red China, the conferees voted to postpone the meeting until November 5 because of the ouster of the President of their host country. The postponed conference may not be held at all. But if it is held, it is a certainty that it will be much less dominated by China and may provide the beginnings of a long-range area organization for these developing countries.

It will still probably be a headache for the United States. As a Western power we will probably come off with faint damnation; certain we can hope for no praise.

Still, the Nations there (if it is held) will be aware that their independence from Chinese domination would not be possible at all if it were not for our presence in Vietnam. At the same time, we should remember they are looking beyond Vietnam.

Vietnam represents a defensible position. We should not delude ourselves that it constitutes a policy for Asia.

Therefore, as these so-called neutralists or Afro-Asians come together, we should be sure we look at their meetings as more significant than mere propaganda forums.

Our effectiveness in helping such moderate nations as Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Iran, Ethiopia, and Malaysia bring into being imaginative plans for progress and reform will in the long run be a lot more important to our position in Asia than decisions over the bombing of North Vietnam.

Finally, we should not forget that these new and emerging nations are in fact thousands of years old. We are bound to make mistakes in dealing with them, for we have different histories, different cultures and in some cases different values.

But the one mistake we cannot afford is to look for easy answers or to be impatient in the search for quick answers.

Asia has been waiting in semi-isolation for thousands of years. We will not find our way through its labyrinth in so short a period as the decade we have been in Vietnam.

## Lyndon Johnson Today

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recognizing that we have been operating in the 89th Congress under a one-party system, and in most cases a one-party press, it is interesting to note at least some change in the attitude of the press, as evidenced by the attached article by Laurence M. Stern, a staff writer for the Washington Post, entitled "Lyndon Johnson Today," which was published in the September issue of the Progressive.

The article follows:

LYNDON JOHNSON TODAY

(By Laurence M. Stern)

Wondrous and inscrutable is the chemistry of Presidential public relations. For 18 months it sustained for Lyndon B. Johnson

August 31, 1965

A4910

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

an incredible bull market of personal popularity.

He was the Presidential colossus who seemed to have reduced all about him to Elihu Putnam scale. On Capitol Hill he was the miracle man credited with bringing to harvest a treasure of social legislation such as the Nation had not seen since Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal 3 decades ago. Foreign capitals looked upon him with a growing sense of disquiet but also with a growing fascination: Here was a President who was as uninhibited in the use and display of American power as any in their memory. Certainly he wore the fastest gun and carried the biggest stick since Teddy Roosevelt.

The American people—not Georgetown or Berkeley, Greenwich Village or Madison, Wis.—but Americans by the tens of millions accepted and supported his leadership. The well-thumbed public opinion polls in the President's pockets told him so.

But as the summer of 1965 ripened in Washington, a subtle reaction set in. Objectively, little seemed to have changed. The big bills were still coming to harvest—medicine, voting rights, education, housing. In Vietnam the war and the prospects for settlement continued to look worse day by day. In Paris the willful Charles de Gaulle was intransigent in thwarting the grand design of the United States for a cohesive Atlantic community. In Santo Domingo there was a rancorous atmosphere of stalemate.

The locus of change was Washington. It was an alteration not of measurable facts so much as the imponderables of political atmosphere. There was, for one thing, a flowering of journalistic critique directed not so much against the mainstream of Johnson policies but at the Presidential person and his "style."

The President-watchers in Washington depicted what some might have taken as a new Lyndon Johnson; a host of uncommon adjectives emerged to describe him—crude, volcanic, tyrannical, power seeking—but no longer 10 feet tall. A sense of irritation was welling in the Capital City at the big Texan's coarse-grained and imperial ways. Stories that had made the rounds of the dinner and cocktail circuit now found their way into print. Example: There was this State trooper who caught up with a speeding white Lincoln on a Texas highway, took one look at the man behind the wheel and gasped: "Oh, my God!" And the driver growled: "That's right, and don't ever forget it."

Irritations grew in foreign capitals, too, at the decline in consultation by Washington before such crucial international decisions as the bombing of North Vietnam and the intervention in Santo Domingo. "We're expected to do chores for you in Hanoi," one widely respected European observer confided, "and yet our Government is not informed of major policy decisions until after they are carried out." How does the White House view this growing buzz of discontent abroad? "Presidents have too often been captives of those who are not President," one top-ranking Johnson man answered with a touch of testiness. "Informing is not consulting" contends one influential Washington columnist who is devout in his admiration for the President but who concedes that shrinkage of meaningful contact between the White House and other world capitals is a conspicuous weakness of the Johnson administration.

Suddenly the writing of a Lyndon Johnson profile became an imperative art form in Washington journalism. A British correspondent flew from London to Austin in pursuit of the quintessential Lyndon, and drew an appreciative but unsparingly clinical portrait of the President, including some favorite scatological usages.

The marvel of it all is that for the more than 30 summers Lyndon Johnson has spent in Washington he has been all these things: crude, volcanic, and power seeking. Those

lash marks on the backs of the White House aids in "Herblock's memorable cartoon, "Happy Days on the Old Plantation," were by no means fresh wounds.

Creeping normalcy has returned to Washington after the profound shock of President Kennedy's assassination and the eerie political convulsion of the 1964 campaign, when a major party was captured by the rump movement of a candidate who, in his heart, wanted to repeal 30 years of American history. The United States had been through a lot.

The real and the mythical Lyndon Johnson probably come closest to coinciding in his management of the Nation's domestic affairs. During his first 20 months in the White House, Mr. Johnson reaped from Congress those fruits which Democratic oratory had sown through at least five prior presidential elections.

It is trite to say that Lyndon Johnson understands Congress as perhaps no President before him. But it is unarguable: He knows all the sharps and flats, the faults and tolerances.

It is also true that the 89th Congress from which President Johnson was to wring his most impressive string of victories is, like the Roosevelt Congresses of the 1930's, a sport of history and politics. It took a Barry Goldwater as well as an incumbent Lyndon Johnson to fashion such a Congress. There was also a Supreme Court ruling on reapportionment that was to make its first impact in the makeup of the 89th, battering down some of the rotten boroughs that helped to sustain private hegemonies on Capitol Hill. The Johnson landslide had added nearly 40 Democratic votes in the House to ratify his programs and 2 in the Senate over those majorities with which John F. Kennedy had had to work.

For the first time since earliest New Deal days the conservative coalition, which had laid the heavy hand of deadlock over White House-Capitol relations, was significantly breached. That venerable band of autocrats such as Senator HARRY F. BYRD and Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, and Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, which had delighted in frustrating Chief Executives for years, was suddenly mute and passive. At one time Lyndon Johnson had, of course, been the preeminent member of their club.

The famous Johnson doctrine of consensus (the term is Walter Lippmann's, the President insists, not his) is nothing other than a total commitment of Mr. Johnson's formidable energies toward the center of the public spectrum—whether the issue be a railroad strike or a legislative program. Membership in the consensus party is especially open to those with the constituencies and the votes, whether in the establishments of civil rights, big business, big labor, or the Senate minority. The consensus party embraces the Negro revolution's Martin Luther King, Jr., big business' John T. Connor, labor's George Cabot Lodge, Jr., President Johnson's comprehension of men and their power is what stamped him as a genius of the Senate machine and is one of the most practical gifts he brought to the White House.

Mr. Johnson has played the role of a typical southern conservative on racial matters until well into the late 1950's. His transformation into the most ardent champion of the American Negro ever to occupy the White House has evoked taunts of criticism from conservative Republicans and liberal Democrats. But this change in the man is another measure of the awesome ambition and sense of political purpose that helped to win the 1964 presidential election for him, the prize denied to generations of highly skilled southern politicians since the Civil War.

The famous Johnson piancy was piquantly underscored in two editions of the same

Lyndon Johnson biography—one published in 1956 and the second in 1964—by Booth Mooney, his former Senate aid. The later edition was sanitized of uncomplimentary references to Americans for Democratic Action (for which the President has little personal regard) and of tributes to States rights.

In his domestic programs the President has played the role of a great consolidator, bringing to fruition proposals enunciated long before he came to office. But the role of the American President is to innovate too. And in this area of performance the Johnson administration has so far failed to score any marks of distinction.

The efforts by the administration to impart to itself a cachet of culture have been lumberingly ludicrous. It has resulted in a war on automobile junkyards (a species of eyesore in which Texas leads the Nation) just at the time shattered automotive hulks have become the rage of the New York Pop art salons. The solemn gimmickry of the beautification campaign has planted a few flowers in the squalor of Washington's slums, courtesies of the First Lady. But on the wholly meaningful issue of roadside controls, the administration made strategic concessions to the billboard lobby led by an old Johnson acquaintance from Waco, Tex.

While Mr. Johnson has brought a new sense of momentum to Capitol Hill, the doctrine of consensus has put a cautionary break on another less-visible sector of Government—the regulatory agencies. No longer is there heard the abrasive crusading of the early New Frontier days, such as former Federal Communications Commission Chairman Newton W. Minow's assault on the "wasteland" of television.

How can it be forgotten that it was in a regulatory arena over which the FCC held life-or-death authority that the President's Texas television empire flourished? The Pulitzer Prize winning series by the Wall Street Journal's Louis M. Kohlmeler showed how the L.B.J. Co. prospered under a series of seemingly providential rulings by the Commission. While there is no evidence on the record of overt intercession by Mr. Johnson in behalf of the company, few in the President's home town of Austin take seriously the official assertion that Lady Bird with her business acumen did it all.

President Johnson has enjoined his men to act as "judges, not advocates" even though their primary statutory responsibility must be to serve as public watchguards.

The White House looked the other way when the tobacco lobby and its congressional agents suspended the rulemaking powers of the Federal Trade Commission on cigaret advertising. That two of the President's oldest Washington confidants, attorney—now U.S. Supreme Court Justice—Abe Fortas and former Kentucky Senator Earl Clements were associated with the tobacco industry lobby is a fact that is certain not to enhance confidence in the integrity of governmental process in the Great Society.

Also Mr. Johnson has shown no special pleasure at the vigorous policies of the Kennedy-appointed Federal Power Commission toward regulating the gas and electric utility industries. The FPC supervisor rate structures that, in aggregate, cost consumers sums many times the amount which, as taxpayers, they provide for the antipoverity program.

The central question is not whether Mr. Johnson wants Charles R. Ross, the pro-consumer Vermont Republican whose reappointment to the FPC dangled for a full year, or Joseph C. Swidler, the retiring chairman, to serve on his Federal Power Commission. The matter of appointments is a jealously held prerogative of the Presidency. Rather, the issue is whether Mr. Johnson wants to continue the strong regulatory policies begun under Swidler or favors a return